



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 October 2023

by Mrs Chris Pipe BA(Hons), DipTP, MTP, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25th October 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/D3505/D/23/3327575

3 Charlottes, Copdock and Washbrook, Ipswich, Suffolk IP8 3HZ

- 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 Miss Hann against the decision of Babergh District Council.
 - The application Ref DC/23/02415 dated 22 May 2023, was refused by notice dated 18 July 2023.
 - The development proposed is described as proposed two storey front extension and alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. Since the submission of the appeal the National Planning Policy Framework (2021) has been superseded by the National Planning Policy Framework (2023) (the Framework). However, in relation to this appeal the aims of both sets of policies are similar. No party would be prejudiced or caused any injustice by me proceeding with the appeal in light of this change in policy.

Main Issue

3. The main issues in this appeal are the effect of the proposed development on (i) the character and appearance of the Special Landscape Area and area in general; and (ii) parking provision.

Reasons

Character & Appearance

4. The site is a semi-detached two storey property located on a prominent corner of Back Lane and Charlottes within a predominantly residential area. Properties in the area are varied in terms of design and form. Notwithstanding this on the adjacent corner forming the entrance into Charlottes are a pair of semi-detached properties which mirror the appeal site and adjoining property in terms of form, materials and brickwork decoration, this adds to the character of the area.
5. The proposed development would substantially increase the mass and bulk of the existing property, creating a disproportionate and incongruous addition to the property. The proposed development would be an unsympathetic addition

to the area dominating the existing property, which would unbalance the entrance feature the adjacent properties create into Charlottes.

6. Policy CR04 of the Babergh Local Plan (2006) (the Local Plan) identifies that development proposals within Special Landscape Areas will only be permitted where they maintain or enhanced the special landscape qualities of the area, identified in the relevant landscape appraisal; and are designed and sited so as to harmonise with the landscape setting. Substantive evidence has not been provided by the Council to confirm what the special landscape qualities of the area are, nor has any landscape appraisal been provided. On this basis I not persuaded that the development would harm the Special Landscape Area.
7. Notwithstanding this I find that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the area in general. There is conflict with Policies CN01 and HS33 of the Local Plan, which amongst other things seek to ensure developments are of an appropriate scale, form and design to the existing dwelling and wider setting.
8. There is also conflict with the Framework which seeks amongst other things to ensure developments are of good design.

Parking Provision

9. Parking standards for developments are outlined in the Suffolk Guidance for Parking Technical Guidance (updated 2019). The Council have confirmed that 3 parking spaces are required for 4+bedroom dwellings.
10. The appellant has drawn my attention to the existing parking arrangements, confirming that there is a large garage with an offroad parking space in front, offering 3 parking spaces. Whilst this maybe the case, substantive evidence has not been provided to confirm the amount of existing car parking spaces available and if they would offer satisfactory car parking provision. Nor has substantive evidence been provided to justify a reduction in the required parking spaces.
11. I find that the proposed development has failed to demonstrate that there is adequate parking provision. There is conflict with Policy TP15 of the Local Plan which seeks to ensure developments would not create a highway safety or amenity problem.

Conclusion

12. For the above reasons I conclude that this appeal should be dismissed.

C Pipe

INSPECTOR