



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/25/3368269

13 Manor Gardens, Saxmundham, Suffolk IP17 1ET

- 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 M Williams against the decision of East Suffolk Council.
 - The application Ref is DC/25/1285/FUL.
 - The development proposed is described as follows: 'Two-storey extension on the north west side of the property, within the internal corner of the current 'L' shaped dwelling footprint. Raise the first-floor wall height under the existing lower height mono-pitched roof area, after removing the roof, in order to construct a twin, dual pitched, hip-ended roof structure to span the area including the area of the two-storey extension created above. Install insulation within the roof space and two banks of solar P.V. panels on the south south east roof slopes for energy self-sufficiency. As a result of the works, the extra space created plus the existing space, will be configured as detailed on drawing 601-02'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The effect of the proposals on the character and appearance of the dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The dwelling at No 13 is one of eight houses I counted which are built to a common design pattern. These frame the entrance and mainly occupy one side of this larger estate of 1960s residential development. This original house design is based on conjoined mono-pitched elements: one taller, narrower and deeper and the other wider but at a staggered set back and lower height. Architecturally, the designs are very much of their time, when modern design approaches displaced more traditional forms. The asymmetrical arrangement is pleasingly articulated with a varied arrangement of sharp angles and elevations, which combine to provide what I judge to be a good quality design of this period. Where other dwellings have been enlarged, this has generally preserved this original character. Thus, this matching group of dwellings continue to provide a level of visual coherence which contributes to the quality of character and appearance of this residential area.
4. The proposal is to replace the lower height mono-pitched element with a full width, entirely two storey addition with a double ridged hipped roof. This bulky, poorly articulated addition would overwhelm and spoil the currently well-proportioned and pleasingly articulated form of the current house. Particularly unfortunate would be the prominent south-west elevation to this corner plot dwelling. As proposed, this

would present views of a largely unarticulated and unrelieved expanse of gable brickwork, capped by diminutively scaled hipped roofing. The Council states in the delegated report that it considers the extension is largely acceptable in scale given its reduced height in comparison to the existing two storey element. However, looking at the proposal afresh in the context of this appeal, it is difficult to reconcile the size and bulk of the addition proposed with successfully preserving the character and appearance of the house and its surroundings.

5. Despite matching materials, the scale, massing and proportions of the proposed extension would detract from the character and appearance of the existing house and that of the surrounding area, in conflict with Local Plan¹ Policy SCLP11.1 and Neighbourhood Plan² Policy SAX1. These policies remain consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). This is in particular regard to the requirement of paragraph 135 for developments to be visually attractive as a result of good architecture and sympathetic to local character. The proposal fails in these regards, with Framework paragraph 139 cautioning that development not well designed should be refused.

Balance and Conclusion

6. Notwithstanding its architectural merits, I recognise the appellant has lived at No 13 since new and is best placed to attest to its current shortcomings in achieving contemporary energy efficiency standards. The proposed extension provides the loft space necessary to provide adequate roof insulation and the optimal roof orientation for solar panels. Although significant weight is given to the support provided by this proposal to energy efficiency and low carbon heating, as required by Framework paragraph 167, I am not persuaded this could not be equally achieved by alterations that preserved the architectural character of the building. Reference is made to the extensions allowed recently at No 15³. Although there is no information as to the energy efficiency of these changes, they demonstrate the Council would entertain more sympathetic additions. I am not persuaded that improved energy efficiency and changes which preserve the dwelling's existing architectural character are mutually exclusive.
7. For the reasons given, this proposal would have an adverse effect upon the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the surrounding area. This harm would not be outweighed by the energy efficiency and carbon saving benefits of the scheme, which might equally be achieved through more sympathetic changes. Accordingly, I conclude that the appeal fails.

Jonathan Price

INSPECTOR

¹ Suffolk Coastal Local Plan adopted 2020.

² Saxmundham Neighbourhood Plan 2022-2036 – adopted July 2023.

³ Council references DC/23/2574 and DC/25/0522/PNH.