

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 April 2017

by J A B Gresty MA MRICS

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

Decision date: 3 May 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/L2630/D/17/3168534

1 Pine Close, Harleston IP20 9DZ

- 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 A Brown against the decision of South Norfolk District Council.
 - The application Ref 2016/2360, dated 6 October 2016, was refused by notice dated 5 December 2016.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a two-storey extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a two-storey extension at 1 Pine Close, Harleston IP20 9DZ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2016/2360, dated 6 October 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) 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.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plan: Proposed Extension Drg No. 2930.01.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the local area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a detached chalet bungalow with a distinctive and prominent steeply sloping roof. The property is situated on a cul-de-sac which is characterised by similarly designed dwellings set back from the road behind front driveways and gardens. Although there are some smaller bungalows on Pine Close of different designs, the uniformity of design and layout of the chalet bungalows contributes to the cul-de-sac having a spacious, planned character and appearance.
-

4. The appeal proposal includes a side extension which would have first floor accommodation in the roof space. The extension would reflect the design of the host building and in particular it would have a steeply pitched roof which would reflect the design of the host building's roof. Also, as a consequence of the proposed extension's projection to the side of the dwelling and setting of the ridge of its roof slightly below that of the main roof, the distinctive appearance of the existing roof would be maintained.
5. The appeal property is in a prominent location on a corner plot within the cul-de-sac. The proposed extension would project about five metres from the side of the host building, occupying part of the open garden to the side of the dwelling. As a consequence of its size and position, the extension would be open to view from distance across the cul-de-sac and would increase the prominence of the appeal property in the local landscape. However, the appeal property is situated in a good-sized plot with a grass verge next to it and the extended property would appear in proportion to the size of its plot and location.
6. Also, the extension would not stand close to any of the other dwellings in the cul-de-sac and, therefore, the regular layout of the chalet bungalows which have similar sized visual spaces between them would be unaffected. Consequently, whilst the extension would result in a significantly larger property than most of the other dwellings on the cul-de-sac, the development would have limited effect on the planned character and appearance of the cul-de-sac as a whole.

Conclusion

7. At the heart of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development. In this case the proposed development would reflect the distinctive design of the host property and other chalet bungalows on Pine Close. Further, as a consequence of its position in a spacious corner plot, the development would maintain the open and planned appearance of the cul-de-sac as a whole. Accordingly, with regard to its effect on the character and appearance of the local area, the proposed extension would represent sustainable development as sought by the Framework and it would accord with the requirements for good design contained in Policy 2 of the Joint Core Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk, and Policies DM 3.4 and DM 3.8 of the South Norfolk Local Plan. Therefore, for the above reasons, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.
8. For the sake of clarity, I impose a condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans and, in order to ensure the satisfactory appearance of the proposed extension, I impose a condition requiring the materials used in the external surfaces of the extension to match those of the existing dwelling.

J A B Gresty

INSPECTOR