



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 December 2024

**By Terrence Kemmann-Lane JP DipTP FRTPI MCMI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 31 December 2024

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/X3540/D/24/3348652**

**11 Grayson Avenue, Pakefield, Lowestoft, NR33 7BB**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
  - The appeal is made by John and Clare Burgess against the decision of East Suffolk Council.
  - The application Ref is DC/24/1331/FUL.
  - The development proposed is extend first floor dormer.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed development on the streetscene of Grayson Avenue.

### Reasons

3. The appeal property, No.11 Grayson Avenue, is a chalet style house with a steeply pitched, previously extended roof and is faced in a mixture of render and cladding. Surrounding buildings are predominantly single storey in height, with similar cladding. The property is located in the Pakefield area of Lowestoft, outside the South Lowestoft Conservation Area, in a residential neighbourhood.
4. The proposal seeks to enlarge the existing south side dormer extension by a further 2.3m in width. It is at present 6m long and protrudes as far as the original side walls of the bungalow. In its present form, the degree of impact is such that the front gable remains the dominating feature. The present dormer roof is in the form of a catslide. The proposed extension would extend out from the bottom of the catslide as a flat roof. It would be constructed over an existing ground floor side extension which is shown to provide a store at the front with a utility room and study behind. The proposed extension of the dormer would project almost as far as the side boundary with the neighbour at its rear corner and to within about 1m from the tapered boundary at the front corner. The chalet bungalow is already considerably taller than the three gable fronted bungalows neighbouring on each side, due to what I understand was an increase in height approved in 2015.
5. The existing dormer is an obtrusive feature, made all the more apparent by the height of the chalet rising above its neighbours. The proposal would be a substantial addition to the existing dormer, making it more apparent in the streetscene. This would be out of keeping with its surroundings, and thus harmful to

the streetscape of Grayson Avenue. It would exacerbate the present lack of harmony of the chalet with the general run of bungalows on both sides of this part of Grayson Avenue.

6. I have noted the extent of local support that has been provided in the appellant's documentation. However, the extent of the harm to the appearance of the dwelling and its neighbours, and the streetscape in general, is unacceptable. For these reasons the appeal will be dismissed.

*Terrence Kemmann-Lane*

INSPECTOR