



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 March 2025

By Terrence Kemmann-Lane JP DipTP FRTPI MCMI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/X3540/D/24/3350692

49 Westland Road, Lowestoft, NR33 9AD

- 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 Ms Grenney and Mr Scupham against the decision of East Suffolk Council.
 - The application Ref is DC/24/1288/FUL.
 - The development proposed is a front extension and internal alterations to suit.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed front extension on dwelling, the streetscape and its surroundings.

Reasons

3. Westland Road in the vicinity of the appeal site is straight with fairly deep open plan front gardens. It is in a well-established residential neighbourhood of south Lowestoft, lined with a variety of modern 2-storey houses and chalet bungalows. Most of the houses and the bungalows in the immediate area appeared to have been altered significantly over the years, with extensions at the front being evident. For instance the neighbouring bungalow at No. 51 has an extension across most of its frontage under a mono-pitch roof that runs down from immediately under the dormer window. A similar extension has been added to the next bungalow, No.53. Smaller front extensions to the next and also to the final bungalow in this group have been constructed across about half of their front elevations. All of these are ground floor extensions, and appear to be no more than about 2m deep.
4. The appeal bungalow has until now maintained its original un-extended form, with a small front dormer matching those of the other three chalets in the group. The proposal is to construct a gabled front, the ridge of which would run forward at the same height as, and at right-angles to, the existing ridge. The new front elevation would be 3.5m forward of the existing front of the bungalow and would extend the full width of the building. It would thus have much of the appearance of a 2-storey house, except that the eaves would be set lower, with the first floor accommodation having partially sloping ceilings. The appearance of the dwelling would also change as the existing buff colour brickwork would be replaced by white/off-white render on the ground floor, with composite cladding boards on the upper parts. The tiles on the new roof would match the existing.

5. The appearance of both the bungalows and the houses in the vicinity is not such that there should be an over zealous approach to preserving their original form and features, especially given the additions that have already taken place. That appears to be the approach taken by the council in previous decisions. My decision in this case rests more on the visual outcome of the proposal than the extent to which the original identity as a group is retained.
6. In this respect the wide shallow pitch of the projecting gable is neither satisfactory in itself, nor in its departure from the narrow form of the 2-storey gables of the neighbouring houses. This would be exacerbated by the squat appearance of the gable, set close above the first floor windows. In addition, the extent of the forward projection, length of the ridge and its unsatisfactory joining with the existing roof at the same level, and the prominence that would arise from the choice of materials, all lead to the conclusion that it would result in an overly dominant and negative impact upon the streetscene.
7. At my visit I paid particular attention to the example mentioned of the development at No.30 Westland Road. As far as I could tell, this house was originally of the same form as the next door chalet bungalow at No.28. There are however, marked differences between the development at No.30 and the appeal proposal. No.30 is at the junction of Landspring Lane with Westland Road which gives it a transitional position, so that its relationship with the bungalow at No.28 is not immediately apparent. Furthermore, the 2-storey gabled element of the forward projection covers roughly half of the front elevation, the other half being a single storey under a mono-pitched roof running up to the underside of the dormer. As such it reflects the design of the 2-storey houses in the area. For these reasons, I do not consider that this amounts to a precedent that aids the appellants' case.
8. I appreciate that the proposed development would provide advantageous accommodation to the household. I also note that there were no objections by neighbours, but I view the proposal as being detrimental to the appearance of the subject dwelling, as it would be incongruous and dominant addition. It would not amount to good design and would be harmful to the public domain. However, I am not persuaded that there would be a loss of light and outlook to No.47, as suggested in the refusal reason.
9. In this case I judge that the public harm outweighs the personal benefit of the scheme to the appellants. This would be in contravention of Policy WLP8.29 of the East Suffolk Waveney Local Plan 2019. For these reasons the appeal will be dismissed.

Terrence Kemmann-Lane

INSPECTOR