
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 February 2017

by Christa Masters MA (hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 9th February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/L2630/D/16/3160911

26 West End Avenue, Costessey, Norfolk, NR8 5BA

- 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 J Green against the decision of South Norfolk District Council.
 - The application Ref 2016/1693, dated 15 July 2016, was refused by notice dated 21 September 2016.
 - The development proposed is conservatory to front elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a detached bungalow set in a relatively spacious plot on the corner of West End Avenue and Breydon Drive North. There is a low level wall surrounding the boundary of the property. The properties have a uniform appearance from the street scene, and have front gardens and off road parking.
 4. My attention has been drawn to policy DM 3.4 and DM 3.8 of the South Norfolk Local Plan (LP). Policy DM 3.4 advises that residential extensions should incorporate a good quality design which maintains or enhances the character and appearance of the building, street scene and surroundings. Policy 3.8 sets out a number of design principles applying to all development. These include, that the scale, height and appearance of a development is designed with a satisfactory relationship within the site and a successful integration into the surroundings.
 5. The conservatory proposed would be located on the front elevation of the property facing the West End Avenue road frontage. It would be positioned in a prominent location in relation to both the host property and street scene. The location, size and materials proposed would introduce an alien feature to this elevation of the property, which would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area as a result.
-

6. I acknowledge that the property is located on a corner plot and this enhances the visibility of the property. I also note that the appellant states the conservatory would be screened by an existing hornbeam hedge. However, I am not convinced that screening an uncharacteristic development would make the proposal acceptable in planning terms. I also acknowledge that there have been no objections raised by neighbours to the proposal. Nevertheless, the lack of objections does not address the clear development plan policy conflict I have outlined above. The appellant has referred to other properties along the road with kitchens protruding from the front elevation. However, these examples do not provide sufficient justification to allow a development which would conflict with the development plan policies set out above.
7. I therefore conclude the proposal would cause material harm to the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore conflict with policy DM 3.4 and DM 3.8 of the LP as set out above.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons set out above and taking into account all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Christa Masters

INSPECTOR