
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 November 2017

by R Norman BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

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

Decision date: 17th November 2017.

Appeal Ref: APP/V2635/D/17/3180648
20 Falcon Road, Feltwell IP26 4AJ

- 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 Verdun Baptist against the decision of King's Lynn and West Norfolk Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 17/00821/F, dated 25 April 2017, was refused by notice dated 29 June 2017.
 - The development proposed is to build a conservatory to the front aspect of the property projecting 4m and 3.1m wide.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises a bungalow located at the end of a cul-de-sac. Falcon Road hosts a number of bungalows set on either side of the road, some of which have been altered since their original construction. Nevertheless the appearance of the area is one of a comprehensively designed estate cul-de-sac. The proposal would introduce a forward projecting conservatory onto the front elevation of the existing bungalow. The siting and projection of this would sit forward of the adjacent bungalows and would therefore appear prominent in the street scene. The location of the bungalow, at the end of the cul-de-sac would make the development very visible on approaching the site and it would be dominant and incongruous in the street scene. Whilst views from the sides of the dwelling would be limited to the occupiers of the surrounding bungalows, it would nevertheless be an intrusive and prominent feature which would detract from the character and appearance of the existing cul-de-sac.
4. The proposal would be constructed with a gable feature to the front, be in a darker colour of frame and have a window sill height wall which would serve to blend the conservatory with the dwelling to some degree. However, this would not be sufficient to mitigate against the prominence of the conservatory as a result of its location and projection at the front of the dwelling.

5. A number of the bungalows within Falcon Road have been extended and altered since their original construction, however none of these extensions project forward to the extent that the proposed development would. The conservatory to No 4 Falcon Road has been identified by the appellant, and whilst this has resulted in a conservatory which is visible from the front of the dwelling, it was set within an infill and therefore does not project forward from the original front elevation of the bungalow. I note that this example has used white uPVC for its construction, which is somewhat noticeable within the street scene, however its location, set in line with the front elevation means that it is not wholly comparable with the proposal. In any case, this does not represent a positive contributor to the predominant character and appearance of the area here. As such, these alterations are not comparable to the appeal proposal and do not set an acceptable precedent in this instance.
6. For the above reasons, the proposal would result in harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area. It would therefore fail to accord with Policy DM15 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan (2016) and Policy CS08 of the King's Lynn and West Norfolk Borough Council Core Strategy (2011). These policies seek to ensure that new development is of a high quality design which responds to the context and character of its local setting. Furthermore, the proposal would fail to comply with the National Planning Policy Framework which attaches great importance to the design of the built environment.

Other Matters

7. I have had regard to the lack of objections from neighbours and the Parish Council however these do not outweigh the harm to the character and appearance of the area and host dwelling identified above.

Conclusion

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

R Norman

INSPECTOR