



---

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 August 2023

**by A.Graham BA(hons) MAued IHBC**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 19 September 2023**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/W3520/D/23/3322448**

**17 Crowley Road, Needham Market, Ipswich IP6 8BJ**

- 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 and Mrs Salisbury against the decision of Mid Suffolk District Council.
  - The application Ref: DC/23/01153 dated 07 March 2023, was refused by notice dated 12 May 2023.
  - The application is for proposed single storey front extension including open porch and alterations.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## Procedural Matter

2. Since the determination of this application a revised National Planning Policy Framework (The Framework) was published in early September 2023 whose main focus was not directly relevant to this appeal. Nevertheless, I have determined this appeal in accordance with the revised provisions within the Framework.
3. The description above has been taken from the Appellant's original planning application form and differs somewhat from both that used on the Council's decision notice and on the Appeal form. Accordingly, I have used the description on the original application form as this more accurately describes the development proposed.
4. During the site visit, for reasons beyond the my control, the agreed appointment time was missed by some 10 minutes. Despite this, I am confident that I saw everything that was needed of the site from the property frontage and the adjacent road.

## Main Issues

5. The main issues are the impact of the proposal upon the living conditions of neighbours and the character and appearance of the area.

## Reasons

6. The appeal property is a double fronted semi detached house likely dating to the mid 20<sup>th</sup> century. The property is red brick with a small central porch and

there is also a flat roof side extension that appears contemporary with the houses.

7. The house is located on an estate of similar properties that appear a fair example of mid century local authority housing. As a result most houses have generous gardens and are often bounded by hedges or fences and are of a relatively consistent appearance using simple materials of orange/red brick and pantiles.
8. The appeal property has a well stocked garden with trees and vegetables and a hedge bounds the front boundary. Notably, and due largely to the topography of the area, the site slopes and as such the front elevation is lower than that of the site frontage and the highway here. As such the garden tends to dominate the front of the property with the house itself sitting comfortably within and set well back from the street frontage.
9. The proposal before me intends to construct a larger porch and extension to the front of the building. The proposed extension would be single storey with a lean to roof and a timber frame porch that would present a partial gable form to the frontage of the property. There would also be two velux type roof light windows to the front lean to and a single window.
10. Materially the extension would be built upon a brick plinth before the material would change to a grey/green weatherboard cladding together with concrete tiles to the roof. The cladding would continue to cover the front of the existing single storey element of the house to the side.
11. I saw on my site visit that there were houses within Crowley Road where similar grey/green weatherboard cladding has been used for side extensions and other modifications. This has therefore introduced a change in appearance to some properties, although I consider that the more characteristic red brick and pantile still dominates and defines much of the area, especially within this part of the street where there is a relative absence of the new cladding visible.
12. In assessing the impact of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the area I consider that the principal of a front extension of sorts would generally be consistent with the overall character of the property and the streetscene. Due to the substantial set back of the proposed extension from the road, the physical impact of any extension would also be lessened. As such I find that the principal of such an extension would not lead to such undue harm so as to lead me to dismiss this appeal. Neither would the form of the timber gable which I consider could also work subject to appropriate detailing.
13. However, the extent of the projection forward from the principal front elevation by around 3.9m would introduce something that would appear out of scale with the existing property and would certainly not integrate with the projection that one would generally expect from a front porch. Even with the slope of the land here and the richly planted front garden, the protrusion of the extension would cause some notable harm.
14. This harm could perhaps be partially mitigated through the use of more appropriate materials, however the proposed cladding would introduce a largely alien material into this part of the street that would not offer any enhancement upon the existing property. Indeed, when combined with the size and scale of

the proposed extension overall, this cladding material would compound the overall harm as would the concrete roof tiles which would not be in keeping with the overall quality of materials nearby.

15. Although I accept that contrasting materials can work in older contexts, these are generally of an equally high quality as those of the original. In this case, the cladding and concrete roof tiles offer a poorer quality alternative that undermines, rather than enhances the original design of the property.
16. The evidence before me offers no alternative palate of materials in this instance and, although such an extension may well be able to be made to work were brick materials to be proposed, I have no such alternative before me and as such I am unable to consider, nor insist, upon such a change through condition.
17. The other issue with regards this proposal is the potential impact upon the adjoining neighbour through a protrusion of around 3.9m from the common front elevation. However, this would be set well within the site boundary by the width of the existing lounge. Therefore, I consider that the proposal would be unlikely to affect the living conditions of the adjoining neighbour through either over shadowing or over dominance. In light therefore of no evidence to suggest otherwise I consider that the scheme would be acceptable in this regard.
18. In conclusion, although I find no harm to the living conditions of neighbours, and although the principal of a front extension could be made to work here, the overall size, scale and poor quality materials proposed would ultimately lead me to the conclusion that the policy requirements within Saved Policies GP1, H18 of the Mid Suffolk Local Plan as well as Policies LP03 and LP24 of the Babergh and Mid Suffolk Joint Local Plan have not been met through the proposal before me.

### **Conclusion**

19. For the reasons given above, and taking into account of all other matters raised, I dismiss the appeal.

*A Graham*

INSPECTOR