
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: 3 March 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/F2605/D/17/3167158

12 Larch Close, Attleborough, Norfolk NR17 2HB

- 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 Christopher Halford against the decision of Breckland District Council.
 - The application Ref 3PL/2016/1398/HOU, dated 15 November 2016, was refused by notice dated 12 January 2017.
 - The development proposed is a single storey front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey front extension at 12 Larch Close, Attleborough, Norfolk NR17 2HB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 3PL/2016/1398/HOU, dated 15 November 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plan: NH/16/57/1 Rev E.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in the appeal is the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the adjacent occupants.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a bungalow which is at the end of a cul-de-sac and on an estate of similar dwellings. The bungalow is sited forward of its neighbour by about 2m and I saw on my visit that it is separated from the adjacent bungalow by a similar distance. The Council has previously approved a front extension to the property of 3.95m in depth but the proposal seeks to increase the depth to 4.75m. The original bungalow is 'L' shaped in plan and the proposed extension would be level with the forward most part of the dwelling.
 4. The extension would be next to a front window in the adjacent dwelling and although the resulting building would project about 6.75m forward of its neighbour the gap between the dwellings would provide some separation. For
-

this reason and given that views of the extension from the neighbour's window would be at an angle I find that the proposal would not be unduly overbearing to the neighbour.

5. Furthermore the extension would be to the north-west of the adjacent window and this orientation would be unlikely to result in any material effect on sunlight or daylight to the adjacent dwelling. For these reasons the proposal would not harm the living conditions of the adjacent occupants. It would accord with policy DC 1 of the Breckland Core Strategy and Development Control Policies (2009) which requires that there is no unacceptable effect on the amenity of neighbouring occupants.
6. A condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plan is necessary to provide certainty and a condition requiring the external materials to match the existing building is necessary to ensure the appearance of the extension is acceptable.

Conclusion

7. For the reasons given I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Nick Palmer

INSPECTOR