
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 February 2017

by Nick Palmer BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

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

Decision date: 1 March 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/V2635/D/16/3163185

33 Church Road, Flitcham, King's Lynn PE31 6BU

- 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 Ivan Browne against the decision of King's Lynn and West Norfolk Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 16/01482/F, dated 11 August 2016, was refused by notice dated 19 October 2016.
 - The development proposed is demolition of an existing flat roof rear extension and side 2 storey pitched roof element and construction of a new 2 storey pitched roof side and rear extension with a flat roof infill to the rear with a detached garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in the appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is one of a pair of semi-detached houses which date from the mid-19th century. The houses are constructed of red brick with pantile roofs and are adjacent to a former public house which is of brick and flint with a similar roof. These buildings are typical of the traditional development in the village. They are within the Flitcham Conservation Area and together with other buildings along the nearby roads are identified as important unlisted buildings on the Conservation Area map.
 4. The appeal property is prominently sited on the corner of a side road. In common with its neighbour it has a two storey side projection with a gabled roof. The side projection on the adjoining house has been extended to the rear while that on the appeal property retains its original proportions. This feature is clearly visible and prominent in the street scene while the extension to the adjacent property is largely hidden by the existing buildings.
 5. The rear extension to the adjoining house results in some imbalance in the pair of houses but this would only be seen from the rear. From the front the balance remains intact notwithstanding that the ridge line of the side projection on the adjoining house has been raised. The proposed extension would significantly alter the appearance of the front of the dwellings because it would be much wider than the original side projection. It would be out of scale with
-

the original design and would result in the pair of dwellings having an imbalanced appearance from the front. This would clearly affect the architectural integrity of the building and the street scene. The extension would have a significant impact on the latter because of its prominent siting on the corner and its visibility in views along Church Road.

6. The proposed garage would be to the rear with access from the side road. Traditional materials could be used and I do not find that its general design including its mono-pitch roof would necessarily be out of keeping with the area. However in combination with the proposed extension it would add to the bulk and extent of development and to its impact on the character and appearance of the area.
7. For the reasons given the proposal would harm the significance of the building which is a non-designated heritage asset and would neither preserve nor enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. The harm to the Conservation Area would however be less than substantial in that the general design of the extension would match the architectural features and form of the dwelling. In accordance with paragraph 134 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) it is necessary for me to weigh that less than substantial harm against the public benefits of the proposal.
8. The enlargement of the existing residential accommodation may be of benefit in terms of providing an attractive family house which may in turn be of benefit to the local community. However there is no specific evidence before me in this regard and I give limited weight to any public benefit in this respect.
9. An existing small rear flat roof extension would be removed but this is not particularly harmful because of its limited size. The existing access drive would be moved a short distance further away from the road junction but no evidence has been put forward to demonstrate that the existing access is prejudicial to highway safety. For these reasons I cannot give weight to these matters.
10. In accordance with the Framework I give great weight to the harm to the Conservation Area which is not outweighed by the limited weight that I have given to the public benefit of the proposal. I therefore find for the reasons given that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area. It would not accord with policy CS08 of the Core Strategy¹ which requires protection and enhancement of the historic environment or with policies CS06 and CS12 which have similar requirements including in terms of local character. Neither would the proposal accord with policy DM15 of the Development Management Policies² which also has this requirement.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Nick Palmer

INSPECTOR

¹ King's Lynn & West Norfolk Core Strategy (2011)

² King's Lynn & West Norfolk Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan (2016)