



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 May 2022

By Terrence Kemmann-Lane JP DipTP FRTPI MCMI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27TH June 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/X3540/D/225/3291289
9 The Street, Cratfield, IP19 0BS

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr and Mrs C Glennon against the decision of East Suffolk District Council.
 - The application Ref. DC/20/2751/FUL dated 23 February 2020, was refused by notice dated 22 November 2021.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a detached garage building.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposal on the streetscene.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two-storey semi-detached house which forms part of a cluster of houses, arranged in 5 semi-detached pairs. Within this cluster, the dwellings have very long front gardens that range in depth from approximately 17m to 25m, and are generally open in character with the front boundaries marked by low hedges and fences. The depth of the appeal garden from its front elevation of the house to the boundary with the highway measures 24.8m. Opposite Nos. 1 to 4 there are 2 pairs of semi-detached dwellings set on shallow plots, close to the highway boundary, but their presence does not affect the issue in this case, and this proposal has to be seen primarily in the context of the 5 pairs of semi-detached houses just described. They have retained a uniform character in spite of side additions that have been made to a number of them. The proposed garage would be very much at odds with the open front gardens which are so much a feature.
4. At my site visit I noted that along the boundary between No.8 and the appeal property there is a substantial hedge, about 2m or so high, in close proximity to the site of the proposed garage. I also noted that this hedge appears to be within the curtilage of No.8, and so is not in control of the appellants. This hedge would, to a large extent, reduce the impact of the garage from views across the gardens to the north-west, save for the roof. I see from submitted photographs that the hedge has been cut to a much lower height in the past; no advantage could be gained from its presence, since its height could not be controlled by a condition as it is outside the appellants' control.

Conclusions

5. I am led to the conclusion that the impact of the proposed garage would be harmful to the streetscene to an unacceptable extent, and that this outweighs the private benefit that the garage would bring to the appellants. For that reason I will dismiss the appeal.

Terrence Kemmann-Lane

INSPECTOR