



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 July 2025

by T Bennett BA(Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/D3505/D/25/3362747

46 Strickmere, Stratford St Mary, Suffolk CO7 6YG

- 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 P Woolard against the decision of Babergh District Council.
 - The application Ref is DC/24/05561.
 - The development proposed is a garage and porch extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are:
 - the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area, and
 - whether there would be appropriate parking provision.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal site is a link-detached dwelling located within a 1970s residential estate. Properties are similar in style, predominantly two-storeys with a rectangular plan form. Front elevations are simple in appearance, and garages linking dwellings maintain a consistent building line and roof form, with consistent ridgelines. This general uniformity is a pleasing characteristic of the estate and this part of Strickmere.
4. The garage extension would have a pitched roof with a front-facing gable end. It would utilise matching brickwork and tiles. The ridgeline of the front gable would be set down from the ridge of the existing garage, with the eaves reflecting those of the existing garage. It would thus appear subordinate in scale to the host dwelling. Viewed in isolation, it would relate well to the host dwelling.
5. Moreover, front-facing gables on garages are not an incongruous feature in the street scene, with several examples observed, including Nos 18, 24, 26 and 50 Strickmere. However, these either relate to detached garages, or to detached properties that are not garage-linked to a neighbouring property. They, therefore, are not viewed in the same context and are not directly comparable to the appeal proposal.

6. The 3 metre forward projection of the garage beyond the neighbouring garage, along with the front-facing gable end would harmfully disrupt the pleasant consistency observed on the linked garages on Strickmere, appearing as an incongruous and conspicuous addition. It would thereby cause harm to the simple but pleasing character and appearance of the streetscene, notwithstanding that it is not within or near a heritage asset. Its subordinate appearance against the host dwelling and more limited projection of 2 metres from the front elevation of the neighbouring property would not sufficiently mitigate the harm identified.
7. The appellant contends that as this part of Strickmere does not have the deep, grassed frontages observed at properties further to the east of the appeal site, it would not be eroding open green space. However, as dwellings on this part of Strickmere are located closer to the highway, this only serves to highlight the increased prominence the proposal would have. Whilst the front boundary treatment would limited views of the proposal when travelling from the east, it would nevertheless be highly visible when travelling from the west.
8. I acknowledge that the proposal seeks to inject some visual interest to the street scene, however I am not persuaded that the proposal is the only way in which this could be achieved.
9. The proposal also seeks a porch extension, the Council found no harm with this element, considering its limited depth I have no reason to come to a different view.
10. For the reasons above, I conclude that the proposed development would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the area. It would be contrary to Policies LP03 and LP24 of the Babergh and Mid Suffolk Joint Local Plan – Part 1 (2023) (JLP) which together, amongst other matters, seeks development that maintains or enhances the character and appearance of the street scene and responds to and safeguards the existing character.

Parking

11. The Suffolk Guidance for Parking (2023) sets out that for a garage to count towards a parking space allocation, it must have a minimum internal dimension of 6 metres by 3 metres if additional fixed storage for cycles is provided.
12. The proposed extension to the garage, which in its existing form is too narrow to use, would measure over 3.6 metres in width, over 1 metre wider than the existing garage, exceeding the minimum width requirements. The overall length of the garage would measure approximately 6.5 metres, however due to a recess towards the rear of the garage, the depth available for a vehicle would be 4.9 metres. While this falls short of the length set out in the guidance, because of the recess at the rear, there would be ample provision for cycles.
13. Considering the average length of vehicles submitted by the appellant, I am satisfied that despite the garage falling short of the parking guidance, the proposed length of the garage, in combination with the increased width, would be sufficient to accommodate a vehicle. The proposal would therefore not have an adverse effect on parking, with two vehicle spaces still being provided at the property and on-street parking would not be required.
14. For this reason, on this issue, I conclude that the proposal would provide appropriate parking provision. The proposal would accord with Policy LP03 of the

JLP, in so far as it seeks to ensure sufficient parking spaces are provided. Whilst there would be some minor conflict with part 3 of Policy LP29 as it would not strictly accord with the relevant parking guidance, it would accord with the general thrust of the policy which seeks safe and suitable access and to ensure development does not lead to unacceptable impacts on highway safety.

Conclusion

15. In conclusion, whilst I have found that the development would provide appropriate parking provision, it would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the area. The proposal conflicts with the development plan and there are no material considerations of sufficient weight that indicate the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

T Bennett

INSPECTOR