



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 October 2024

by A Hartley, LLB(Hons), Solicitor, MBA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 November 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/D3505/D/24/3345491

8 Council Houses, Ipswich Road, Holbrook, Suffolk IP9 2QX

- 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 James Welham against the decision of Babergh District Council.
 - The application Ref is DC/24/01243.
 - The proposed development is for a two storey rear extension and renovation of the elevations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The effect of the proposal on
 - the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area, and
 - the living conditions of the occupants of the neighbouring dwelling at 7 Council Houses, with particular regard to privacy and outlook.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The appeal property is a two storey semi-detached dwelling occupying the end plot of a group of eight houses comprising two semi-detached pairs and one terrace of four houses. The appeal property reads clearly as part of this group. The group retains a strong sense of uniformity at both the front and rear of the dwellings. This is evidenced by the small front porches and the general absence of extensions, together with long front and back gardens. There are outbuildings to the rear of the properties, however, the dwellings are largely unaltered and retain a high degree of symmetry at both the front and rear.
4. The appeal proposal would introduce contemporary materials and architectural details to the front elevation and a modern two storey rear extension with Juliet style balconies. The proposed modern materials include cladding and new fenestration openings together with a full width porch feature at the front of the property. These changes to the front elevation would be at odds with the traditional and uniform design features of the group of houses described above

to which the appeal property relates. This element of the proposal would therefore appear incongruous within the streetscene and thus cause harm to the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area.

5. My attention has been drawn to the permitted development rights that would allow a front porch without planning permission. Even if the canopy element of the proposal could be constructed without planning permission, I find that the changes to the front elevation through the introduction of the cladding and the changes to fenestration proposed would be more harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area than a canopy alone.
6. There are no other two storey rear extensions within the group of dwellings. Their absence provides a sense of openness to the rear. This positive feature would be disrupted by the introduction of a two storey rear extension at the appeal site causing harm to this element of the character of the area.
7. The scale, bulk, massing, design and appearance of the rear extension would also disrupt the very evident rhythm of smaller scale single storey outriggers to the rear of the group of dwellings. The roof pitch would not match the host dwelling and would appear awkward. The depth of the rear extension would be considerable and it would cover the entire width of the host dwelling. This would fail to respect the form and character of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.
8. Although the plot is of a generous size, the appeal proposal as a whole would have a negative impact by unbalancing the high degree of symmetry within the semi-detached pair that presently contributes positively to the character of both the host dwelling and the surrounding area at both the front and rear of the dwellings.
9. My attention has been drawn to examples of new housing and modern and renovated dwellings in the wider area. However, I find that due to the specific relationship with the group of dwellings, the modern design of the appeal proposal would appear incongruous causing harm to the identified traditional design character evident in this group.
10. In conclusion, the proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. Consequently, it would conflict with policies LP03 and LP24 of the Babergh and Mid Suffolk Joint Local Plan – Part 1 (2023) (LP), policy HNP05 of the Holbrook Neighbourhood Plan (2023) and paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) as it would not maintain or enhance the buildings, streetscene and surroundings or be sympathetic to the local character of the area.

Living Conditions

11. The appeal proposal would introduce a two storey rear extension in close proximity to the boundary with the adjoining neighbour at No. 7, together with Juliet style balconies at first floor level. Although there is already a degree of overlooking from first floor windows across the neighbouring rear garden, the provision of large windows with balcony features would alter the vantage point and increase scope for overlooking the adjoining rear garden. This would cause unacceptable harm to the privacy of neighbouring occupiers at No. 7.
12. Although there would be no unacceptable impact on daylight and sunlight to the neighbouring occupiers due to the orientation of the dwellings, the height

and depth of the two-storey rear extension close to the boundary would be overbearing. As such, this would cause loss of outlook.

13. I conclude that the proposal would harm the living conditions of the occupants of the neighbouring dwelling at No. 7, with particular regard to privacy and outlook. Accordingly, the proposal would conflict with policies LP03 and LP24 of the LP and paragraph 135 of the Framework as it fails to provide a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

Other Matters

14. No objections have been received from neighbours or the Parish Council. However, consideration must be given to ensure that the proposal would function well not just for the short term but for the lifetime of the development, including future occupiers.
15. The appeal proposal would provide additional living accommodation for a family, however, I do not find that this benefit outweighs the identified harm caused by the appeal proposal.

Conclusion

16. For the above reasons, the proposal conflicts with the development plan taken as a whole and there are no material considerations including the Framework that outweigh the harm caused by the proposal. I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

A Hartley

INSPECTOR