



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 October 2025

by **Jonathan Price BA(Hons) DipTP DMS MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/X3540/D/25/3372685

Swiss Cottage, Aldeburgh Road, Aldringham cum Thorpe, Suffolk IP16 4QH

- 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 Phillip Simpson against the decision of East Suffolk Council.
 - The application Ref is DC/25/1902/FUL.
 - The development proposed is described as follows: 'Erection of a double garage and small workshop to the front of the house located 2m from south boundary and 2m from west boundary. The size is 8.5m X 6m with the garage doors facing the house. The area in front of the house is approx. 30m X 20m with no loss to the existing parking arrangements and will gain 2 spaces. The garage to be of timber frame construction feather edge board cladding and red tile hipped roof to keep the ridge high low.'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. Swiss Cottage is a brick-built chalet bungalow of a pleasing architectural character, enhanced by its quite spacious setting, set back comfortably from the street. Whilst the humbler design of the proposed workshop might be intrinsically satisfactory for its purpose, it would appear incongruous in such a prominent position to one side of the front garden and to the fore of the main residence, with its finer architectural character. The proposed building is quite large and would be visually out of place in such a conspicuous position, detracting markedly from the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene it occupies. Although existing vegetation offers some screening on the approaches to the property, it would nonetheless comprise a visually dominant feature when viewed from the road adjacent.
4. The other dwellings in this immediate section of ribbon development observe a similar building line as Swiss Cottage, with an absence of ancillary structures within their front gardens. In such a context, this proposal would not relate well to the character and appearance of the host property or the residential street scene of which it forms a part. Whilst screening vegetation would in time soften the rather stark appearance of what is proposed, this factor is insufficient to overcome the harmful effects. Consequently, the scheme fails to respond to local character and the form of surrounding buildings, which in this section of linear development

maintains ancillary buildings to the side or rear of the main residences. The proposal therefore conflicts with Policy SCLP11.1 of the 2020 Suffolk Coastal Local Plan (LP).

5. Where the Council has allowed front garden buildings elsewhere along this road, these decisions have evidently reflected the individual merits of each case. A number are cited as precedents in support of this proposal. The cartlodge allowed at Chediston Lodge¹ is not in the immediate vicinity of this proposal and does not fall within the same linear arrangement of housing. It comprises a smaller structure, set behind pre-existing outbuildings which are themselves screened behind mature roadside hedging, therefore not comprising such a discordant feature as in this case.
6. In the other direction and on the opposite side of Aldeburgh Road, three further front garages to the fore of dwellings are drawn to my attention. These are along a private drive parallel to the main road and set back behind a wide intervening highway verge. The double garage allowed at Lancey House² is of a brick and tile, hipped roof design which marries well with the design of the host dwelling. Set back from the main road behind more established vegetation, this lacks the same degree of incongruity as I find in this case. On the same private access, the design of the double garage permitted at York Rise³ relates well with the contemporary character of the host dwelling, and so equivalent issues of discordance and incongruity also do not occur. Nearby, the carriage house and cart lodge allowed at Two Hoots⁴ is a shorter version of that proposed in this case. However, like its neighbours, this property is set back from the main road behind dense, well-established vegetation, and does not have the same visual prominence found with this proposal
7. Considerably further way, the double garage allowed at 100 Leiston Road, Aldeburgh⁵ forms part of a run of linear housing of a somewhat more compact arrangement than in this case. The next-door bungalow at No 98 has a similarly placed double garage to its fore. The permitted building is smaller and the surroundings less spacious. The impacts are not entirely comparable and lend little support to this current case.
8. The examples given by the appellant do not establish a binding precedent, nor define the prevailing character and appearance of the street scene in this particular location. None are sufficiently similar in nature to justify the harm found from this proposal. Even if these other examples were in any way comparable, it remains well-established practice that each planning case be considered on its own, individual merits.
9. Although the harm would be localised and commensurate with the small scale of the proposal, the objectives of LP Policy SCLP11.1 align with those of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) to achieve well-designed places.

¹ DC/22/2904/FUL - Brick, Timber (oak) and Tile Single Storey 2-Bay Cart lodge with Open Front, Back and Sides | Chediston Lodge Aldeburgh Road Aldringham Cum Thorpe Leiston Suffolk IP16 4QF.

² DC/21/4014/FUL - Proposed double garage with hipped roof | Lancey House Aldeburgh Road Aldringham Cum Thorpe IP16 4QL.

³ DC/20/4122/FUL - Proposed Side and Rear Extension to existing Dwelling plus Detached Garage | York Rise Aldeburgh Road Aldringham Cum Thorpe Suffolk IP16 4QL.

⁴ DC/18/2157/FUL - To erect a 4.8M x 7.2M Cart Lodge/Garage with a tiled pitched roof in my front garden approximately 110cm from the boundary with my neighbour at Ash Cottage.

⁵ DC/24/2997/FUL - Construction of a detached garage | 100 Leiston Road Aldeburgh Suffolk IP15 5PX

Therefore, the conflict with development plan policy in this regard attracts significant weight. The environmental harm deriving from this would outweigh any very small degree of public benefit, either social or economic, provided. The Framework's presumption in favour of sustainable development would therefore not apply in this case.

Conclusion

10. This proposal would have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the area, in conflict with Policy SCLP11.1 and the LP as a whole. For the reasons explained, having taken into account all other matters raised, I conclude the appeal should be dismissed.

Jonathan Price

INSPECTOR