



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 February 2018

by Nick Palmer BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 February 2018

Appeal Ref: APP/J3530/D/17/3190835
67 Holly Road, Kesgrave, Ipswich IP5 1HX

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr & Mrs Doug Barker against the decision of Suffolk Coastal District Council.
 - The application Ref DC/17/2437/FUL, dated 6 June 2017, was refused by notice dated 22 September 2017.
 - The development proposed is erection of single storey front, side and rear extension (including reconstruction of roof to attic accommodation).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for erection of single storey front, side and rear extension (including reconstruction of roof to attic accommodation) at 67 Holly Road, Kesgrave, Ipswich IP5 1HX in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref DC/17/2437/FUL, dated 6 June 2017, 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: 2016170/10B, 2016170/11B, 2016170/12D, 2016170/13C and 2016170/14B.
 - 3) No development shall take place above slab level until details / samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details / samples.

Main Issues

2. The main issues in the appeal are the effects of the proposal on:
 - i) the living conditions of adjacent residents; and
 - ii) the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

Living Conditions

3. The existing dwelling is a bungalow of modest proportions which occupies quite a long narrow plot. It is at the end of a row of dwellings on Holly Road. On its other side there are the rear gardens of bungalows off Yewtree Grove which

face the side boundary of the site. The ground levels fall so that the Yewtree Grove properties are at a lower level than the appeal property while 65 Holly Road is at a higher level. The proposal would amount to an extensive re-modelling of the existing bungalow. This would be extended to its front and rear and the roof height would be increased to provide attic accommodation. There would be two side projections with hipped roofs facing the Yewtree Grove properties.

4. The Council's first reason for refusal concerns the impact of the proposal on the outlook from the rear of those properties. Numbers 49 and 51 Yewtree Grove face the side of the site while Nº 47 is also close and the rear extension would project past the rear boundary of that property. Those dwellings are separated from the site by a solid fence which I saw is about 1.8m in height.
5. As the ridge height of the dwelling would be increased by about 2.3m this would significantly increase its visibility and prominence when seen from the rear of the adjacent bungalows. The new roof would however be around 10m or so away from the main rear elevations of those dwellings at its nearest point. The majority of the roof would be set in from the boundary and there would be two hipped elements projecting towards the boundary. Although it would be prominent I find that the roof would not have an unacceptably oppressive or overbearing effect on the outlook from the adjacent bungalows because of its separation distance.
6. Interested parties have expressed concerns about overlooking and loss of light. The first floor accommodation would be lit by roof lights in the side roof slopes. These would be a minimum of 1.7m above the internal floor level thus ensuring that there would be no overlooking of the neighbours on either side from those windows. The rear bedroom window would face along the rear garden and any potential for overlooking of adjacent properties from that window would be limited and not harmful. As the roof would slope away from the adjacent bungalows and would be to the north it would not adversely affect sunlight or daylight to those dwellings or their gardens.
7. 65 Holly Road is a chalet dwelling which is at a higher level than the site. The proposal would result in the overall heights of the two dwellings being similar. I saw that that dwelling has a rear conservatory which is set in from its side wall, two obscure glazed ground floor windows in its side elevation, two small first floor windows and a front bay window. There is quite a limited gap between the two buildings. I take into account the orientation of the appeal proposal directly to the south of that property but no detailed evidence is before me regarding any effect on sunlight or daylight to that dwelling. Any effect on the rear conservatory would be likely to be limited as this extends across most of the width of the adjacent dwelling. The proposed front extension would extend forward of the bay window by less than 3m and its roof height would be less than that of the main roof.
8. The reason for refusal does not concern any effect on sunlight or daylight to the neighbouring property. Having considered the detailed design of the proposal in relation to the windows in the adjacent dwelling I find no reason to conclude that there would be any undue detrimental effect on the living conditions of the occupants of that dwelling.

9. Policy DM23 of the Development Plan Document¹ (DPD) requires consideration of matters including outlook, privacy, access to daylight and sunlight and the resulting physical relationship with other properties. For the reasons given the proposal would accord with that policy and would not result in unacceptable harm to the living conditions of adjacent residents.

Character and Appearance

10. Holly Road is characterised by bungalows but there are also chalet designs including the neighbouring property. On the other side of Holly Road further to the south I saw that there is a recent development of two storey houses. The proposal would be in keeping with this context in terms of its height and design.
11. Following a previous refusal the bulk of the proposal has been reduced and the hipped roof design would minimise its massing. The Yewtree Grove bungalows extend closer to Holly Road than the existing dwelling. Those bungalows are screened from view by a hedge along Holly Road. That hedge would also screen the front extension in views from the south. From the north the front extension would not be unduly intrusive as it would be seen in the context of the adjacent bungalows. The two side extensions would not extend fully up to the boundary and space would remain on both sides of the dwelling. This would ensure that the dwelling would not appear cramped in relation to its plot.
12. For these reasons I find that the proposal would relate well to the scale and character of its surroundings as required by policy DM21 of the DPD. That policy also requires extensions to respect the original building and to be visually recessive. The proposal would alter the form and design of the original building but in doing so it would provide a coherent design. The design quality would be of a suitably high standard. Although there would be some conflict with policy DM21 the proposal would accord with the design requirements set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). For the reasons given I conclude on this issue that the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the area.

Conditions

13. I have imposed the conditions suggested by the Council and in doing so have had regard to the tests set out in paragraph 206 of the Framework. A condition specifying the approved plans is necessary to provide certainty and a condition requiring details of external materials to be approved is necessary to ensure the appearance of the development is acceptable.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Nick Palmer

INSPECTOR

¹ Suffolk Coastal District Local Plan Core Strategy & Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (2013)