



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 July 2025

by **Victor Callister BA(Hons) PGC(Oxon) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 04 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/D3505/D/25/3366540

Brookfield, Chapel Lane, Belstead, Ipswich, Suffolk IP8 3LR

- 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 & Mrs Mark & Katie Burrows against the decision of Babergh District Council.
 - The application Ref is DC/24/05213.
 - The development proposed is to raise the pitch of the roof to create a first floor with three dormers to the front and two to the rear; extend to the side increasing the size of the garage with first floor space above; single-storey extension to the rear to create a kitchen/diner; build a porch on the front.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted to raise the pitch of the roof to create a first floor with three dormers to the front and two to the rear; extend to the side increasing the size of the garage with first floor space above; single-storey extension to the rear to create a kitchen/diner; build a porch on the front at Brookfield, Chapel Lane, Belstead, Ipswich, Suffolk IP8 3LR in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref DC/24/05213, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: AB3, AB5, AB7, AB9, AB10, AB11, AB12, AB13 and AB14.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the local area.

Reasons

3. The appeal dwelling is a detached single storey bungalow, located in an area predominantly made up of a mixture of detached bungalows, dormer bungalows and 2 storey houses.
4. The appeal dwelling sits within a row of 5 single storey detached bungalows of differing architectural expression and terminal height, but of generally similar scale. They are bookended at either end of the street by larger 2 storey detached houses. The other side of the street is made up of a mixture of detached 2 storey houses and dormer bungalows. The dwellings in the area exhibit a wide variety of

architectural expressions and scale, with little visual cohesion, although of good quality design individually. The dwellings in the immediate local area have relatively generous separating distances between them and are generally set well back from the street. Overall, this gives a spacious feel and is significant to the streetscene and character and appearance of the immediate local area of the appeal dwelling.

5. The proposal is to extend the appeal dwelling to the side and rear, as well as by the addition of a second floor of living space. This would be achieved by adding an additional floor into an enlarged and raised roof structure. The design for this would draw on exemplar architectural forms and details seen in the architectural design of bungalows and dormer bungalows in the immediate local area, including neighbouring dwellings. Particularly in the use of pitched dormer windows within the proposed second floor roof form to front and rear .
6. The proposed enlarged roof would raise the terminal height of the roof of the appeal dwelling by approximately 2.5 metres. The height of the roofs of neighbouring bungalows vary and appear to be greater than that of the existing appeal dwelling. The dormer bungalows and houses in the area are taller again and demonstrate great variety in height. Consequently, the proposed additional height of the roof of the appeal dwelling would not result in it appearing as unduly prominent or incongruous within the street scene.
7. The relatively modest increase in height of the proposal and the use of dormer windows, set within a roof form that encloses the proposed additional first floor, would result in the proposed additional bulk appearing recessive and as a subordinate and secondary addition to the appeal dwelling. This would have the effect of the proposed additional floor of living space appearing as sensitively massed in relation to the appeal dwelling and surrounding properties.
8. As such, the proposal as a whole would result in the appeal dwelling continuing to sit in harmony with the surrounding variety of dwellings, including within the varied small run of bungalows within which it currently sits. Consequently, I find that the proposal would result in the appeal dwelling reflecting the general scale and variety of properties within the street scene, when viewed in direct and more oblique views along the street, and would complement the existing street scene.
9. For these reasons, I find that the proposal would not result in any significant harm to the character and appearance of the local area and would not be in conflict with Policies SP09, LP03 and LP24 of the Babergh and Mid Suffolk Joint Local Plan (2023) and Paragraphs 131, 135 and 139 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2024). Collectively these seek development of a high standard of architectural design, that is visually attractive, safeguarding and harmonising with the character and appearance of the existing building, streetscene and the local area, and maintaining a strong sense of place.

Conditions

10. As well as the standard condition for the timing of implementation, in the interests of design quality I have attached a condition requiring compliance with approved plans. I have had regard to the Council's suggested conditions for ecological uplift on the site. However, the proposed development is of a type that is exempt under the Biodiversity Gain Requirements (Exemptions) Regulations 2024 and, as there

are no site specific requirements for ecological uplift, there is no requirement needed to be fulfilled to make an otherwise unacceptable development acceptable in this regard. The proposed conditions relating to ecological uplift are, therefore, unnecessary. As such, these proposed conditions do not meet the test for conditions set out in the NPPF (2024).

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, the appeal is allowed

Victor Callister

INSPECTOR