

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 November 2022

by J Bell-Williamson MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 December 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/X3540/D/22/3306871

76 Links Avenue, Felixstowe IP11 9HE

- 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 Z Muktaar against the decision of East Suffolk Council.
 - The application Ref DC/22/2494/FUL, dated 21 June 2022, was refused by notice dated 15 August 2022.
 - The development proposed is two storey and single storey extensions with attached garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a detached two storey dwelling in a residential cul-de-sac. No 76 is located at the end of a row of detached dwellings next to a parking area and a small area of public open space.
 4. Policy SCLP11.1 of the East Suffolk (Suffolk Coastal) Local Plan (2020), concerning design quality, says that development proposals will be permitted where they respond to local context, including that the overall scale and character should clearly demonstrate consideration of the development as a whole in relation to its surroundings.
 5. Despite their individual design, the dwellings in this part of Links Avenue, including No 76, display a good degree of uniformity in terms of built form, layout and external materials. This is apparent from the consistent building lines and frontage widths, and the limited gaps between dwellings.
 6. I agree with the Council that the front porch extension would be a proportionate addition to the appeal property, which would appear as subordinate to the original built form. Similarly, the continuation of the single storey element to the side and rear, and the single storey garage would be of
-

typical domestic proportions and appearance. As such, these features would not result in harmful changes to the appeal property.

7. The two storey element to the side adjacent to No 74 would have a lower ridge height to the existing dwelling and would be of limited width, thereby remaining subordinate to the proportions and appearance of the existing dwelling. Moreover, the dual pitch roof and overall design would integrate effectively with the appeal property. This element of the overall proposal would infill part of the existing space above the single storey garage, narrowing the gap between the appeal property and No 74. However, the existing gap at upper floor level is uncharacteristically large within the street scene, where properties are relatively close to each other. Consequently, the two storey side extension would not result in a harmful terracing effect seen street views.
8. The most significant element is the new two storey extension to the eastern side of the appeal property. This would be of subordinate height and could be accommodated in the available space to the side. However, in combination with the two storey element to the opposite side it would result in a substantively larger dwelling, materially extending the dwelling's frontage width. Consequently, it would appear as a bulky and dominant built form within the street scene by comparison to the largely uniform size of other dwellings. Moreover, the large upper floor window and Juliette balcony would pay little regard to the existing fenestration and other new windows. These features, together with the vertical timber boarding as the main external material, would result in the extension appearing as a contrived and uncharacteristic addition, which would not integrate visually with the character and appearance of the existing dwelling.
9. Despite No 76 being at the end of a cul-de-sac, it is surrounded by other dwellings within a spacious setting, particularly resulting from the adjacent parking area and public open space. As such, despite the nearby trees, the changes proposed would be prominent within the street scene and nearby dwellings from which views the incongruous and uncharacteristic appearance of the extended dwelling would be readily apparent.
10. Therefore, for these reasons, I conclude that the proposed side extensions would have an unacceptably harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. As such, the proposal is contrary to Policy SCLP11.1 of the East Suffolk (Suffolk Coastal) Local Plan, as described above.

Other Matters

11. I have had regard to the matters raised by interested parties, particularly the possible effects of the upper floor extension on the neighboring dwelling, No 74. This includes a bedroom window facing the side of the appeal property. While the extension would narrow the gap between the dwellings, I agree with the Council's assessment that a sufficient gap would remain such that the outlook from this window and natural light received in the room would not be materially harmed. Moreover, the additional small upper floor window to the rear elevation closest to No 74 would not add to the views already available to the rear to the extent that there would be a harmful loss of privacy.

Conclusion

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

J Bell-Williamson

INSPECTOR