
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 November 2023

by Jonathan Price BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI DMS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 December 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/X3540/D/23/3322190

8a Hartington Road, Aldeburgh, Suffolk IP15 5HD

- 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 R Vevers against the decision of East Suffolk Council.
 - The application Ref DC/22/4469/FUL, dated 7 November 2022, was refused by notice dated 24 February 2023.
 - The development proposed is first floor rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The effect of the proposal on
 - the character and appearance of the area.
 - the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers to the west, with particular regard to outlook and privacy.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal property is within a quite densely developed block of Victorian dwellings. These mainly comprise terraced properties which front closely onto the street and have small back gardens. No.8 fronts Hartington Road at its junction with Champion Road. No.8a occupies the rear part of its two-storey outrigger, providing it with frontage onto Champion Road. A gap in the built frontage along Hartington Road provides the side garden to No.8. The back garden to No 8a lies to the rear of this. It has been partly occupied by a full width, single storey flat roof addition, making the remaining back garden rather shallow.
4. The proposed first floor rear extension to No 8a would be built over its existing flat roofed addition. This would provide this presently quite small dwelling space for a re-configured staircase, leading to a third and fourth bedroom with two upstairs ensuite washrooms. The twin gable-ended extension, with an intervening flat-roof, would fit in adequately with the character and appearance of the host property. The combination of render and timber cladding would help differentiate it as a contemporary extension and provide a lighter appearance.
5. Overall, I consider the first-floor rear extension would respond suitably to local context and the form of surrounding buildings in relation to overall scale and

character. As such, I find the proposal to comply with Policy SCLP11.1 of the Suffolk Coastal Local Plan (SCLP) in respect of design quality, as well as with paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), over good architecture and sympathy to local character and history.

Living conditions

6. The back garden to No.8a extends to the side of that at 16, Hartington Road. The next-door garden is already overlooked quite closely by a first-floor bay window serving an existing bedroom at No.8a. As a result of this proposal there would be two overlooking first floor windows, extending nearer to the side boundary of the neighbour's garden. The additional bedroom window to the northernmost gable would partly face No.16's blank gable end. There is also intervening tree growth providing a screen. Whilst I do not doubt this vegetation is to be retained, this would not be subject to control in the long term.
7. There is presently no objection from No.16. Nevertheless, the proposal would result in an increased feeling of being overlooked and having less privacy, reducing the overall quality of living conditions provided at this dwelling. Furthermore, the scale, height and distance to the boundary of the extension would have an overbearing effect on the outlook from the adjacent garden. This would further reduce the quality of living conditions provided for occupiers.
8. Even accounting for the rather dense urban environment in this location, I am of the view that the proposal would have a harmfully overbearing effect on the outlook from the rear of No.16. It would increase the feeling of being overlooked and having reduced privacy within its small back garden. Although there is no objection presently from this address, this proposal would fail to secure acceptable living conditions at No.16, with regard to both outlook and privacy, giving rise to conflict with SCLP Policy SCLP11.2. There would be conflict with NPPF 130 over good design and the need for this to secure a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

Conclusion

9. Although I have found the proposal to cause no harm to the general character and appearance of the area, it would have an unacceptable effect on the living conditions provided at 16 Hartington Road. This is with regard to both outlook and privacy, important considerations in an overall assessment of design quality. For the reasons given, I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Jonathan Price

INSPECTOR