



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 February 2025

**by H Lock BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 February 2025

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/X3540/D/24/3357651**

**30 High Road East, Felixstowe, Suffolk, IP11 9JW**

- 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 Mr L Lutteral against the decision of East Suffolk Council.
  - The application Ref is DC/24/3316/FUL.
  - The development proposed is erection of cart lodge and extension of driveway.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of cart lodge and extension of driveway at 30 High Road East, Felixstowe, Suffolk, IP11 9JW, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref DC/24/3316/FUL, 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 following approved plans: L.L/01/24 Revision A (Location Plan); L.L/02/24 Revision A (Site Plan); L.L/03/24 Revision A (Plan); and L.L/04/24 Revision A (Elevations).
  - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the main dwelling.

### Procedural Matter

2. Since the appeal was lodged a revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), and further revisions, have been published. Having reviewed the changes, I am satisfied that they do not affect the substantive matters of the appeal, and that proceeding without seeking further comments from the parties would not be prejudicial to their cases.

### Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the appeal site and street scene.

### Reasons

4. The appeal property is a large house set back from the road on a relatively wide plot, and the front garden provides a mix of green space and vehicle parking and turning area. Dwellings are diverse in terms of design and scale along High Road

East, and the proximity of buildings to the road also varies, with the appeal property set alongside terraced houses sited much closer to the road. This mixed pattern is found on both sides of the road.

5. The appeal site is on the southern side of the road, and in this section there are no outbuildings in front gardens. However, this pattern of development is more commonplace on the northern side of the road, and double width garages and carports are visible nearby. These are generally set back a short distance from the footway behind planting, but none are fully screened and they are established features in the street scene. The scale and roof form of these garages varies, with most having gabled sides or ends.
6. In this context, the proposed cart lodge would not be out of character with the surrounding built form and the local context. The half-hipped roof is not a typical design locally, but would be acceptable given the different roof styles that are found to dwellings and outbuildings along the road. The proposal would be reasonably large, but seen against a backdrop of a relatively large house. It would not be dissimilar in scale to other double garages in the vicinity, but on what appears to be a wider frontage. Although tall, the building would be set back far enough from the footway so that it would not appear dominant or disruptive in the street scene, particularly with the roof sloping away from the front boundary. Being set to one side of the plot, it would not obscure or dominate the dwelling itself, in accordance with guidance in the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance 16, 'House Alterations and Extensions' 2003.
7. Given the width of the site and the expanse of driveway and garden that would remain, the cart lodge would not erode the currently open character of the frontage. The expansion of the driveway within the site would have a neutral impact on the appearance of the site.
8. I therefore conclude that the proposal would be acceptable in its visual impact on the character and appearance of the appeal site and street scene. It would be of sufficiently high design quality and would respond to local context and the form of surrounding buildings in accordance with Policy SCLP11.1 of the Suffolk Coastal Local Plan 2020; and would be sympathetic to local character and the surrounding built environment as required by the Framework.

### **Conditions**

9. In addition to the standard time limit, I have attached a condition specifying the approved drawings as this provides certainty. For the avoidance of doubt, I have imposed a condition to match materials to those of the existing dwelling, in order to safeguard the character and appearance of the development and the area.

### **Conclusion**

10. For the reasons given above the appeal should be allowed.

*H Lock*

INSPECTOR