
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 August 2019

by S Tudhope LLB (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4 November 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/V2635/D/19/3231291

Aradet, 17 Main Street, Hockwold, Thetford IP26 4LB

- 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 L Zipfell against the decision of King's Lynn and West Norfolk Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 19/00257/F, dated 11 February 2019, was refused by notice dated 8 April 2019.
 - The development proposed is demolition of existing garage and construction of a 2 storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of the occupiers of 15 Main Street with particular regard to daylight and outlook.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling. The unattached neighbouring property, 15 Main Street is a single storey dwelling which is situated in close proximity to its boundary with the appeal building. No 15 has two windows that face the appeal site. The council has advised that these windows serve bedrooms.
4. The proposed development would introduce a two-storey side extension within close proximity to the boundary with No 15. Given the position of the appeal building relative to No 15, the height, scale and proximity of the proposal would significantly diminish the amount of daylight reaching next door. In addition, the proposal would harm the outlook from the flank windows and create an unacceptable sense of enclosure for the occupiers of No 15.
5. I acknowledge that neither the Parish Council nor the occupants of No 15 have objected to the scheme, but this does not alter my view that the proposal would be unacceptable.
6. I conclude that the proposal would have a harmful impact on the living conditions of the occupiers of 15 Main Street with regard to daylight and outlook. The proposal conflicts with Policy CS08 of the Council's Core Strategy

(2011) and Policy DM15 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan (2016). Together, amongst other matters, these policies seek to prevent development from having a demonstrably harmful impact on residential amenity.

Conclusion

7. For the reasons set out above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

S Tudhope
Inspector