

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 August 2022

by J Bell-Williamson MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26TH September 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/W3520/D/22/3294196

7 Fir Tree Lane, Claydon IP6 0RB

- 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 P Alcock against the decision of Mid Suffolk District Council.
 - The application Ref DC/21/06674, dated 9 December 2021, was refused by notice dated 4 February 2022.
 - The development proposed is single storey side extension and part two storey/part single storey rear extension and alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The decision notice includes reference to the extensions overlooking, and giving the feeling of being overlooked to, neighbouring properties. However, this matter is not substantiated in the officer's report, in which it is concluded that the amenity of neighbouring residents will not be unduly impacted. For this reason, I have not addressed this as a main issue. However, for the avoidance of doubt, I consider that the proposal would not have a harmful effect on the privacy of neighbouring residents, particularly as the upper floor windows in the extended dwelling would face directly to the rear.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed extensions on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a two storey detached dwelling in a residential estate of similar properties. It includes accommodation in the roof space with a box dormer covering most of the rear roof slope.
 5. No 7 has a regular plan form with a front gable feature and is of modest depth. The single storey extensions to the side and rear are of typical domestic scale and appearance. As such, they would not add substantive depth or bulk to the rear of the property and, therefore, would not be harmful in this regard.
-

Similarly, from the front the side extension would be seen as a limited alteration that would not upset the proportions of the host dwelling.

6. The two storey gabled extension would reflect the design feature to the front and would appear as subordinate to the host dwelling due to the lower roof ridge. However, it would directly adjoin the existing box dormer, which would result in a visual juxtaposition of the flat roofed dormer with the pitched roof of the two storey extension. This would create a complex roof form that would appear as contrived and incongruous, both in terms of the effect on the host dwelling and in contrast to the simpler, unaltered pitched roofs of neighbouring dwellings. Furthermore, the combined effects of the timber-style cladding, brickwork and green render of the box dormer would heighten the incongruous appearance of the extended dwelling. While these materials may be present on other properties nearby, there are no similar examples of the relationship between different materials as proposed in this case.
7. No 7 is positioned at the end of a row of dwellings with similar building lines. No 8, however, is set much further back resulting in the side and rear elevations of the appeal property being prominent from the surrounding area. From these views and from the neighbouring garden of No 1 Rowan Close, the lack of integration of the two storey extension would be readily apparent. As such, due to this awkward relationship between the previous and proposed extensions the proposal would represent poor design, which would result in material harm.
8. Accordingly, for these reasons, I conclude that the proposed two storey rear extension would have an unacceptably harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. Consequently, it is contrary to Policy GP1 of the Mid Suffolk Local Plan (1998), which requires that development proposals should maintain or enhance the character and appearance of their surroundings; and to Policy H18 of the Local Plan, which requires residential extensions to be in keeping with the size, design and materials of the existing dwelling. It is also contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework, which promotes good design.

Other Matters

9. I have had regard to the representations made by interested parties. There are no additional matters raised that would lead me to reach a different overall conclusion.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above it is concluded that the appeal should not succeed.

J Bell-Williamson

INSPECTOR