



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/F3545/D/23/3326409

Oakley, Thurston Road, Great Barton, Suffolk IP31 2PW

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Hewitt against the decision of West Suffolk Council.
 - The application Ref DC/23/0672/HH dated 25 April 2023, was refused by notice dated 7 July 2023.
 - The development proposed is described as Erection of detached garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. Amended plans were submitted during the application process, reducing the size of the proposed garage, the amended plans were considered by the Council. I have therefore considered this appeal on the basis of the plans refused as outlined on the decision notice.
3. Since the submission of the appeal the National Planning Policy Framework (2021) has been superseded by the National Planning Policy Framework (2023) (the Framework).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

4. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance on the area.

Reasons

5. The site is located within a predominantly residential area where property designs vary. The property is situated on the outskirts of Great Barton within the countryside.
6. I observed during my site visit that there were garages located to the front of plots and that there is a mixture of boundary treatments in the wider area. Notwithstanding this Thurston Road in the area of the appeal site has a rural quality, adjacent open fields bounded by mature landscaping.
7. The location of the proposed double garage to the front of the appeal plot, which currently has a verdant openness, would be a prominent feature. Whilst

there are garages to the front of plots near the appeal site these are set back and not obvious in the streetscene.

8. The proposal would introduce a form of development which in this location would be dominant and incongruous in the streetscene. The effect of the scheme would diminish unacceptably the character and appearance of the area.
9. Landscaping is proposed between the development and Thurston Road which could be controlled through the imposition of a planning condition. Whilst this could soften the appearance of the proposed development this does not persuade me that the proposed development would not cause harm.
10. I conclude that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the area. There is conflict with Policies DM2 and DM24 of the Forest Heath and St Edmundsbury Local Plan, Joint Development Management Policies Document (2015) which seek amongst other things to ensure development respects the prevailing character, scale and design of the locality.
11. There is conflict with Policy GB12 of the Great Barton Neighbourhood Plan 2019-2041 (2021) which seeks amongst other things that developments reflect the local characteristics and circumstances of a site by creating and contributing to a high-quality environment.
12. There is conflict with the Framework which seeks to ensure developments are of good design.

Conclusion

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

C Pipe

INSPECTOR