



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 November, 2020

by A.Graham BA(hons) MAued IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11/02/2021

Appeal Ref: APP/X3540/D/20/3256634

18 Cliff Road, Felixstowe, IP11 9PJ

- 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 David Woolnough against the decision of East Suffolk Council.
 - The application Ref DC/20/0682/FUL, dated 17 February 2020, was refused by notice dated 29 May 2020.
 - The development proposed is for a two storey extension to front and side over the existing garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The impact of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a detached modern house within a largely suburban area that extends to the east of Felixstowe town centre. Whilst there is a variety in architectural styles along Cliff Road, the appeal property forms part of four houses that appear to be originally of the same house design. This design consists of a half brick and render front elevation with a slight protrusion of the left hand element garage and porch. Each property also has a front garden and parking area bounded by low walls or hedges.
4. The proposal intends to alter the front elevation through the creation of a double gable extension, extending nearly the full width of the property. The proposal will retain a small element of the existing garage roof and construct a simple timber frame porch around the central doorway. The extension would not only present a more symmetrical appearance to the streetscene but it would also dramatically alter the original design of the property. Most notably, the proposal would introduce large areas of composite cladding to the first floor gable elements with render and a small buff brick plinth to the ground floor.
5. Whilst the render and small elements of buff brick are consistent with the character and appearance of the appeal property and its immediate neighbours, the introduction of such large areas of composite cladding upon prominent gables would introduce a material and feature that is harmful to the appearance of the area. As a consequence the original group of properties, that

are currently largely consistent in their design, would be harmed through this proposal.

6. The appellant has directed my attention to other examples of extensions in the local area and I saw on my site visit that there are a small number of other properties nearby which have extended or been modified in a similar manner. However, I have no information before me as to the reasons or background to these developments and so I cannot be certain that the circumstances are the same as the case before me. Nonetheless, I do not consider that further such changes would enhance or complement the overriding characteristics of the area.
7. Whilst I consider that an extension in principle could be designed in such a way as to conform with Supplementary Planning Guidance 16, the dramatic alteration of this property, to present large double gable elements clad in this composite material would introduce something largely inconsistent and harmful into the overall street scene and would dominate the original house. As such the character and appearance of the area would be harmed and the proposal would be contrary to policies SP15 and DM21 of the East Suffolk Council Suffolk Coastal District Local Plan Core Strategy.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons above, taking into account all other matters raised, I dismiss the appeal.

A Graham

INSPECTOR