



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 October 2022

by Graham Wyatt BA (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15th November 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/X3540/D/22/3303131

3 Gun Hill Cottages, Church Lane, Levington, Suffolk IP10 0LQ

- 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 C and T Bixby against the decision of East Suffolk Council.
 - The application Ref DC/22/1780/FUL, dated 22 April 2022, was refused by notice dated 6 July 2022.
 - The development proposed is described as a “two storey extension to semi-detached dwelling”.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues in this appeal are the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area, including the Suffolk Coasts and Heaths Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), and the host and adjoining property.

Reasons

3. The appeal site forms a semi-detached two storey dwelling that is located within a rural area and the AONB. The existing building benefits from a two storey extension that has a flat roof and covers approximately half the building. It is similar to the extension on the adjoining property at No.4, which also benefits from a further pitched roof dormer to the side of its two storey extension.
4. The appeal building also has a large single storey extension that protrudes into the garden area, whilst the adjoining property has a mono-pitch conservatory to its rear. As a result of these additions, the traditional form of the two buildings to the rear has already been eroded. Nevertheless, the proposal would alter the appearance of the building, creating a large, bulky development on the rear of the property. It would be at a greater height than the existing extensions creating a very large mass of building on the rear of the property. The sheer scale of the development, taking into account the existing extensions would dominate both the host property and indeed, the adjoining property at No. 4.
5. Given the scale of development it would not affect the landscape and scenic beauty of the wider AONB. However, as the appeal building is set forward of the neighbouring property to the west, and due to the depth and height of the proposed extension, it would be visible from the highway as one passes the site

from the road. Furthermore, the significant mass and bulk of the proposal would also be apparent from the rear of neighbouring properties. Thus, the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

6. The development proposes to extend further into the garden, to create a larger ground floor living area. Although this would reduce the overall garden that is available, I am not persuaded that this would amount to overdevelopment of the site as adequate amenity area would remain.
7. I acknowledge that the appellant wishes to modernise the property and the benefits that would ensue from this. I also note that the development has been revised following dialogue with the Council, and that the extension is unlikely to affect the living conditions of adjoining occupiers. However, neither this nor any other material consideration that has been raised outweighs the harm that I have identified above.
8. Thus, the development would result in harm to the character and appearance of the area, the host, and the adjoining property. It would conflict with Policy SCLP11.1 of the East Suffolk Council Suffolk Coastal Local Plan 2020 which seeks, amongst other things, to ensure that developments respond to local context in relation to the overall scale and character of the building and its surroundings.

Conclusion

9. Thus, I conclude that there are no material considerations of such weight as to indicate that a decision be taken other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

Graham Wyatt

INSPECTOR