



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 October 2023

by Nick Bowden BA(Hons) DIP TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9 November 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/F3545/D/23/3324197

10 Cecil Lodge Close, Falmouth Avenue, Newmarket, Suffolk CB8 0ND

- 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 Clift against the decision of West Suffolk Council.
 - The application Ref DC/23/0425/HH, dated 13 March 2023, was refused by notice dated 12 May 2023.
 - The development proposed is a proposed first floor extension, chimney removal, exterior alterations and associated works.
-

Decision

The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a proposed first floor extension, chimney removal, exterior alterations and associated works at 10 Cecil Lodge Close, Falmouth Avenue, Newmarket, Suffolk CB8 0ND in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref DC/23/0425/HH, dated 13 March 2023, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
- 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans: P-6399-01 and P-6399-03.
- 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Procedural Matters

1. The description of development on the planning application form differs from that on the Council's decision notice and appeal form. I have used the description given on the application form in this instance.

Main Issues

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

Reasons

3. The appeal property comprises a detached, brick built home under a tiled roof. It forms part of a small cul-de-sac of ten dwellings and has the most intimate relationship with its immediate neighbours at 7, 8 and 9 Cecil Lodge Close. The four form a small cluster arranged around a small, open courtyard area. Equally, numbers 3 to 6 form a similar arrangement further down the cul-de-sac. This is a fairly atypical arrangement where homes would normally address

a single principal street. However, it is not an unpleasant arrangement and neatly defines the space between the detached houses which are of a similar vernacular but individually differing designs. It is agreed between the parties that, due to surrounding trees and buildings, the only meaningful public vantage point is from this courtyard area, and I concur with this assessment.

4. The proposed extension would be formed over an existing family room. By comparison to the remainder of the house it would be relatively deep, being approximately the same depth as the main span of the existing house. It would present as a secondary elevation on this corner plot as opposed to an excessively deep extension. Moreover, the extension is set down from the main ridge line and adds a hipped roof to reduce the apparent bulk of the building and provides articulation to this side.
5. The position of the extension within the courtyard area means its public vantage would be highly limited and not appreciable in any other context other than the courtyard area. Given the arrangement of the four houses, this would define the space which is otherwise formed by other buildings. The proposal would not cause harm to character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area and would therefore accord with policies DM2 and DM24 of the West Suffolk Joint Development Management Policies Document 2015 (DMP).
6. The extension would not appear excessive in depth in its context, due to the arrangement and varied style of homes in the immediate locality. It would not read as being out of scale with the existing building. I therefore conclude that the development would comply with policies DM2 and DM24 of the DMP which promote development which respects the character, scale and design of existing dwellings, and the character and appearance of the immediate and surrounding area.

Conditions

7. I have imposed a general time limit condition and condition to ensure adherence to the approved plans for certainty. A condition requiring matching materials is also imposed to ensure an acceptable appearance.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given above, the proposal would accord with the development plan, when read as a whole. Material considerations do not indicate that a decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan.
9. Having considered all other matters raised, I therefore conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Nick Bowden

INSPECTOR