
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 April 2024

by J Bell-Williamson MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2nd May 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/U2615/D/24/3337447

4 The Paddock, Hemsby, Great Yarmouth, Norfolk NR29 4HG

- 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 Max Seaton against the decision of Great Yarmouth Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 06/23/0263/HH, dated 26 March 2023, was refused by notice dated 9 November 2023.
 - The development proposed is front facing extension and entrance porch to existing detached bungalow.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. As the development has been undertaken, I have dealt with the appeal on the basis that it involves an application for retrospective planning permission.
3. The front extension and entrance porch were approved under a previous application¹. The application the subject of this appeal seeks approval for the external materials used for the building, which differ from those in the approved proposal.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the external materials used in the completed extension and porch on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a detached bungalow in a residential cul-de-sac of similar property types. The surrounding area is residential in character.
6. Policy CS9 of the Great Yarmouth Local Plan Core Strategy 2013-2030 (2015) requires high quality design in new development. Policy H9 of the Great Yarmouth Local Plan Part 2 (2021) states that residential extensions will be permitted where they maintain or enhance the character and appearance of the

¹ Ref 06/21/0037/F.

building, street scene, its immediate surroundings and the wider townscape or landscape. Policy 3 of the Hemsby Neighbourhood Plan (2023) requires that all development, including extensions, should have regard to the Hemsby Design Codes in general, and specifically as they apply to distinct character areas, including Hemsby village. However, the Design Codes include limited guidance with regard to external materials specifically in relation to the village character area.

7. The extended dwelling comprises three distinct and different external materials: brick to the original part to the rear, timber cladding to the porch to the side and white render to the extended front part of the building. These different and contrasting materials are highly visible as a whole within the street scene due to the gap between the appeal property and its neighbour, No 6.
8. The extent of the contrast between the materials on a single dwelling gives a jarring and incongruous appearance to the extended property, which consequently lacks visual coherence. This effect is further accentuated by the contrast with the other dwellings in the street. Orange/brown brick and white window frames, rainwater goods, soffits and fascias are the predominant external materials used on the dwellings in The Paddock. Nos 6 and 8 have black or dark grey guttering, down pipes and fascias, but otherwise have the same palette of materials as other properties. As such, this creates a good degree of uniformity of character and appearance.
9. Within this setting the prominent timber cladding, white render at the front of the appeal property, extensive grey frame to the large front window and grey fascias all contrast unfavourably with the established character and appearance of the street scene. Consequently, the dwelling appears as an incongruous and uncharacteristic feature within its surroundings.
10. The bungalows and two storey dwellings in The Pastures also predominantly share the same palette of materials, as they are brick buildings with white window frames, rainwater goods and fascias. The principal exception is No 3, which has a frontage comprising grey render and cladding. However, this is a limited exception to the predominant appearance of properties in the area and I note the Council's comment that it should not be assumed that the materials used have been approved. The different coloured roof tiles to No 1 and the alterations to 'Lamorbey' are not as extensive as the changes to the appeal property and do not combine as many different materials and colours.
11. The appellant draws attention to a number of other examples of development with similar materials at Branton House and the former Pontin's Holiday Centre. However, these are in the wider surrounding area and are not part of the same street scene as the appeal property. As such, their effects are not directly comparable to those of the appeal property within its immediate setting. For the same reasons, arguments concerning the Council's consideration of these other developments against the same policies relied upon in this case are not comparable.
12. The appellant contends that the alterations to external materials could have been undertaken as permitted development subsequent to implementation of the approved scheme. However, the materials for any exterior work forming

alterations to the property would need to be of similar appearance to those used for the existing dwelling, which had orange/brown brick as the predominant material. As such, I agree with the Council that there is no material 'fallback' in this regard.

13. Therefore, for the above reasons, I conclude that the external materials used in the extension and porch have a materially harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene. Consequently, the proposal is contrary to Policy CS9 of the Core Strategy and Policy H9 of the Local Plan Part 2, as described.

Other Matters

14. I have had regard to the representations made by interested parties, which largely raise matters related to the main issue. While the front window to the extension is large there is no reasonable basis to conclude that it is harmful to neighbouring occupiers' privacy. Views from the window are directly towards the side boundary fence of the corner property opposite.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons given it is concluded that the appeal should not succeed.

J Bell-Williamson

INSPECTOR