



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 December 2025

by T Bennett BA(Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/X3540/D/25/3375525

80 Cotmer Road, Lowestoft, Suffolk NR33 9PP

- 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 Ozkul Karausta against the decision of East Suffolk Council.
 - The application Ref is DC/25/3389/FUL.
 - The development proposed is new detached triple garage with hobby room over.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site is in a prominent corner location at the junction of Cotmer Road and Elm Tree Road West. The host dwelling is a large, detached property situated within a spacious open plot, set back from both the front and side boundaries that border the road. The open aspect of the corner plot contributes positively to the spacious character and appearance of the area.
4. Garages in the surrounding area are typically modest in scale, featuring plain roof-slopes and appearing subordinate to the host property. The proposed garage would have a large footprint, with three parking bays on the ground floor. While the ridge height of the garage would be lower than the host dwelling, the proposal would result in a building of considerable height, scale and mass, with a steep pitched roof and dormer on the rear elevation, facing Elm Tree Road West. It would consequently appear as a substantial, dominant building at the corner of Elm Tree Road West and Cotmer Road. As such, I do not consider it to be a subordinate addition to the site.
5. I acknowledge that the garage has been set away from the main dwelling in an effort to maintain the open setting of the host dwelling. However, given its position close to the boundary, combined with its height and large scale, the garage would nevertheless appear as an uncharacteristic and visually dominant feature in the street scene, harmfully eroding the sense of openness and spaciousness of this corner location.
6. Although proposed landscaping around the boundaries would help soften the visual impact of the proposal, planting could die or be removed and cannot be

relied upon in perpetuity. As such, this measure does not sufficiently mitigate against the visual effects of the proposal.

7. Whilst the proposed materials would be similar to those in the surrounding area, this would not mitigate the harm that would be caused by the visual prominence of the building and the resultant reduction in openness.
8. Although many ancillary buildings along Cotmer Road are typically located close to a side boundary, these are not on corner plots and therefore are visually less prominent compared to the appeal site.
9. For the reasons above, I conclude that the proposed garage would have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore conflict with Policy WLP8.29 of the East Suffolk Local Plan (2019) which seeks to ensure that new development is of a high-quality design that complements the local character and distinctiveness, responding positively to the local context.

Planning Balance and Conclusion

10. The garage would enhance the functionality of the host dwelling and provide additional parking for the occupiers, reducing on-street parking demand. However, I am not persuaded that this specific proposal is the only way in which these benefits could be achieved. These benefits do not outweigh the identified harm to the character and appearance of the area and the conflict with the development plan.
11. The proposal conflicts with the development plan and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

T Bennett

INSPECTOR