
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 January 2026

by **R Gee BA (Hons) Dip TP PGCert UD MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9 February 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/X3540/W/25/3376056

12 Kingston Farm Road, Woodbridge, Suffolk IP12 4BD

- 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 Mark Crisp of Chapel Properties Ltd against the decision of East Suffolk Council.
 - The application Ref is DC/25/1557/FUL.
 - The development proposed is described as demolition of existing dwelling and construction of new build dwelling, extension to garage and linking to main house and 2no. additional parking spaces to the front of the property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The appeal site is proximate to a Grade II listed building. I have therefore born in mind the statutory requirements placed upon decision-makers by section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act, 1990 (the Act).

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. No 12 Kingston Farm Road (No 12) is an end of terrace bungalow. It is one of three mono-pitch bungalows, circa 1970's. The properties have a strong uniformity by reason of their alignment, low-profile, asymmetrical roof and materials of construction which form a distinct part of the streetscene.
5. The proposed dwelling would be significantly taller and wider in comparison to adjoining dwellings. The roof profile of the proposed dwelling, facing Kingston Farm Road, would be discordant with the terrace in which it would remain physically attached to. Furthermore, the overall height would be significantly above the ridge height of the remaining properties within the terrace and would not sit comfortably within the street scene. The increased height and scale of the replacement dwelling would appear dominant within the terrace and would be an incongruous addition within the streetscene.
6. It is not disputed that the site is located within a high-density residential area with a variety of properties. Whilst the proposal may reflect the scale and design of other properties nearby, many of which have dormer windows, they do not form the

immediate context of the appeal site. Being physically attached to the existing terrace the juxtaposition of the design, bulk, scale and massing of the proposal would result in a discordant addition to the street scene.

7. My attention has been drawn to nearby development, including at Nos. 24 and 26 Cherry Tree Road¹. From the limited information before me these properties formed a pair of semi-detached dwellings that did not front Kingston Farm Road. Whilst they may be visible in some of the same views as the appeal site their site context is not comparable. Irrespective of the approvals for the redevelopment of Nos. 24 and 26 the appeal site forms part of a terrace of 3no properties which have a consistency in their visual appearance as a whole whereas these properties are physically separated from the appeal site and for this reason is distinctly different from the examples brought to my attention. These other decisions therefore do not lead me to a different conclusion on the main issues in this appeal. In any event, I have assessed the appeal on its own merits.
8. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the terrace and the wider streetscene in conflict with Policy SCLP11.1 of the East Suffolk Council – Suffolk Coastal Local Plan 2020. Amongst other things, this seeks locally distinctive and high quality design that clearly demonstrates an understanding of the key features of local character, including the overall scale and character should clearly demonstrate consideration of the component parts of the buildings and the development as a whole in relation to its surroundings and the height and massing of developments should be well related to that of their surroundings. Conflict also arises with the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which seeks proposal sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change.

Other Matters

9. I have had special regard to whether the setting of the nearby Grade II listed building, Kingston Hall (listed as Kingston Farmhouse), would be preserved. The property lies to the south of the appeal site. The evidence indicates that Kingston Farm Road was once a private track leading to the farmstead until land between Station Road and Kingston Farm Road was developed for residential development. The Kingston Road playing fields, which lie opposite the appeal site, contributes positively to the setting of the listed building. No 12, and neighbouring properties, are low profile dwellings which reduces their visual impact upon the setting of the listed building. Furthermore, their position within the street maintains the view down Kingston Farm Road directly to the farmhouse.
10. Whilst the appeal proposal would increase the height, and therefore the prominence of the dwelling, the nature of the proposal relative to the listed building leads me to the view that its connection to the green open space, views down Kingston Farm Road and the prominence of the Hall within the streetscene, all of which contribute positively to its significance, would not be interrupted by the proposal. For these reasons, I am satisfied that its setting would be preserved.
11. The appeal site lies outside, but adjacent to the Woodbridge Conservation Area (CA). As it is outside of the boundaries of this Conservation Area, the statutory duty within Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act

¹ Ref DC/22/4757/FUL

1990 as amended does not apply. However, the proposed development would still be located within the setting of this designated heritage asset. The CA covers most of the centre of Woodbridge. I consider the significance of the CA is derived in part, from the many historic buildings from the immediate post-medieval years. The historic pattern of development includes expanses of public open space. Whilst the proposal would increase its prominence, when viewed from the CA, in particular from the playing fields, its impact on the significance of the CA would be limited having regard to the context of adjacent twentieth century housing within the streetscene.

12. I am satisfied that the proposed dwelling would provide for satisfactory living conditions for the future occupiers of the dwelling. As this would be a replacement dwelling, and it would have similar vehicle movements, I do not have any highway concerns.
13. I note the evolution of the proposal from a previously refused scheme and pre-application advice. However, I have considered the appeal proposal on its own merits based on the evidence before me.

Planning Balance

14. Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires planning applications to be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
15. The Council accepts that they cannot demonstrate a deliverable five-year supply of housing land as required by Paragraph 78 of the Framework. Consequently, paragraph 11 d) of the Framework is engaged. It states that planning permission should be granted unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies of the Framework taken as a whole.
16. As a replacement dwelling the proposal would have a neutral contribution to the Council's housing land supply. However, it is recognised that it would add to the choice of accommodation within a sustainable location. The proposal has been advanced as self-build. However, there is no mechanism before me to secure the proposal as such. Even if the proposal was occupied as a self-build, the contribution to the overall demand for such housing would be limited. I therefore attach limited weight to this matter as a benefit of the proposal.
17. The development would give rise to some economic benefits during the construction phase and provide limited support to local services. However, these benefits would be tempered given the limited scale of the proposal.
18. The appellant advances that the replacement dwelling would adhere to current Building Regulations standards which embed positive measures to reduce carbon emissions and energy usage. Whilst this would be an environmental benefit considering the emphasis of the Framework on using natural resources prudently, minimising waste and pollution, and moving to a low carbon economy, it is not unusual for new dwellings to be designed to high environmental standards. For these reasons, I give only moderate weight to these benefits.
19. I have carefully considered the benefits advanced by the Appellant. However, having regard to paragraph 11 d ii) of the Framework, I am of the view that the

adverse impacts of the proposal upon character and appearance would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the limited benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole.

20. The proposal conflicts with the development plan and material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. I therefore conclude that the appeal is dismissed.

R. Gee

INSPECTOR