



**Planning Advisory Panel North (7 April 2020)**

**Item 4 - DC/20/0417/FUL - Construction of a rear two storey extension and front porch, 30A Fair Close, Beccles, Suffolk, NR34 9QR**

**DC/20/0417/FUL**

**Construction of a rear two storey extension and front porch  
30A Fair Close, Beccles, Suffolk, NR34 9QR**

**Area Team:** North  
**Case Officer** Chris Green

**The application is at the Planning Advisory Panel because the 'Minded to' decision of the Planning Officer is contrary to the Beccles Town Council recommendation to approve ("with concerns").**

**Beccles Town Council**

*"The committee were concerned about the impact of the porch on the streetscape, but resolved to approve the application with concerns regarding this matter.*

*Approved with concerns*

*The committee wished to note their concerns that other properties along Fair Close have an arched doorway and this is a consistent architectural facade along the streetscape. This feature will be lost with the construction of a porch in the proposed design".*

**Ward Members: Cllrs Elliott, Brambley-Crawshaw and Topping.**

*No comments received*

**Statutory Consultees:**

None consulted

**Non- Statutory Consultees**

None consulted

---

LEGAL ADDRESS East Suffolk House, Station Road, Melton, Woodbridge IP12 1RT

POSTAL ADDRESS Riverside, 4 Canning Road, Lowestoft NR33 0EQ

**Third Party Consultees**

None received

**Officer comments**Site description

Within the Beccles extended conservation area. Number 30 is a double fronted buff brick mid to late Victorian terraced property. This has been subdivided with a new entrance porch provided to the east end that overlaps number 28 with a staggered ownership line. Adjacent to this to the east is the more modern terraced house that reflects some of the proportions and detailing of adjacent Victorian houses. This (number 28) has a gap before the next property.

The proposal site frontage features a rubbed double depth semi-circular brick arch over the entrance door and rubbed flat arches over the window openings. This pattern of front entrance opening is common to all the houses in the terrace to this point where it rises westward up the hill. All the original windows have been replaced by upvc top hung windows with dummy leaded lights and the original front door has gone. The slate roof remains.

The original building has been cut in two to produce number 30 and this site number 30A. To the rear and south, number 30 (east of 30A) features a double storey flat roofed extension to the full width of that residence and of similar depth to that now proposed, with blind flank wall. To the west side there is a single storey outshot on the east boundary of 32.

Proposal

The ground floor rear extension is currently full width and around 8m deep. The proposal is to build over this entirely by one storey and extend this further by 2m to cantilever over the existing ground floor element, all to be surmounted by a flat roof. At attic level a large box dormer is proposed which because of conservation status does not fall within the permitted development rights conferred by Part1 Class B of the General Permitted Development Order.

The proposal is to erect a front porch with a hipped roof to match that on number 30A

Planning Considerations

The proposed porch extension is intended to reflect the existing porch set to the boundary between this property and the more recent number 28. The submitted plans do not indicate the rather well executed arch over the door, and the loss of this by concealment together with the repeat of a rather unattractive porch design in alien materials that has occurred to the east will represent a harm in the conservation area setting not considered offset by any public benefit and therefore

---

LEGAL ADDRESS East Suffolk House, Station Road, Melton, Woodbridge IP12 1RT

POSTAL ADDRESS Riverside, 4 Canning Road, Lowestoft NR33 0EQ

contrary to both local policy WLP8.39 and NPPF paragraph 196. With a decent internal hallway there appears limited functional reason for the porch. The other porch appears to be of a vintage predating the extensions to the Conservation Area made in the early 21st century.

The first floor extension and the box dormer would both be ugly alien features, out of character with the existing building. However, while the land all falls within the Conservation Area designation, the context at the rear of the terraces is much diminished in aesthetic terms by existing similar extensions and ancillary buildings and structures and as such it would not be considered reasonable to refuse planning permission based on Conservation Area or general aesthetic considerations.

The upper floor extension that will result in a two-storey rear offshoot proposed to the rear will not harm the residential amenity of number 30 (east of 30A) as this already features a double storey flat roofed extension to the full width of that residence and of similar depth to that now proposed, with blind flank wall. To the west side however there is a single storey outshot on the east boundary of 32. There are upper bedroom windows close to the proposal however that will lose some light and considerable outlook as a result of impact already occurring from other existing extension to the further west of 32. The ground floor as a result of the interposed single storey off-shot is not considered affected. It is considered that the harm to outlook at first floor level is to an extent that should be refused as contrary to policy WLP8.29.

The large box dormer would, if not on Article 2(3) land normally be permitted development. While ugly, its amenity impact from outlook, or loss of light considerations, given the south aspect is not considered to create material harm. Such box dormers do create overlooking of neighbour's gardens from a high vantage point, but not to the area at the rear of the property that is accorded the highest sensitivity so refusal on impact on neighbouring privacy amenity is not considered reasonable and the proposal in this regard meets the concerns of policy WLP 8.29.

The application submission is also inadequate, in that the submitted plans do not include elevational drawings of the side of the existing ground floor addition, the proposed first floor extension or the box dormer. Therefore, their depth of projection has had to be taken from the floorplans in order to undertake the above assessment. Therefore, even if the proposed scheme were to be deemed acceptable, the application could not be approved in its current form.

### **Recommendation**

Refuse for the reasons outlined above.