



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 October 2019

**by D Hilton-Brown BSc (Hons) CIEEM**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 10 December 2019**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/V2635/W/19/3235005**

**21 Parkside, Snettisham PE31 7QE**

- 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 and Mrs Baker against the decision of King's Lynn & West Norfolk Borough Council.
  - The application Ref 19/00401/F, dated 4 March 2019, was refused by notice dated 21 June 2019.
  - The development proposed is a new semi-detached dwelling.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Main Issue

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

### Reasons

3. The appeal property is one half of an end pair of semi-detached residential houses which front onto Lynn Road and are within the Parkside estate. There is vehicular access to the rear of the property from Parkside and pedestrian access onto Lynn Road.
4. The proposed development would result in the construction of a new 3-bed semi-detached dwelling on the north side of the host property on land that is currently used as a residential garden. The proposed dwelling would be built to approximately the same scale as the host building and use matching materials.
5. It was clear from my site visit that properties in Parkside near to the site are characterised by a defined pattern of development. This is formed by clearly delineated semi-detached properties, mostly surrounded by reasonable sized gardens on three sides.
6. This proposal would erode this characteristic, by virtue of its scale and mass, creating a property with a terraced appearance, which would be incongruous in an area of semi-detached dwellings. I acknowledge that terraced properties are present in the locality. However, these are clearly separated from the semi-detached dwellings and do not hold a prominent position on Lynn Road.
7. The loss of the garden would lead to a cramped appearance and result in the loss of the original pattern of development. This would be exacerbated by the property's prominent position on Lynn Road, where it would clearly be visible when entering the village. As such, the proposal would not be a sympathetic form of development.

8. I have had regard to the appellants' statement highlighting that planning permission has been granted for a variety of extensions in the Parkside near to the site. However, it was clear from my site visit, that these were not directly comparable, as they were subservient extensions to the existing house and not new dwellings of approximately the same scale and mass as the existing property. These existing developments have retained the existing form of semi-detached properties and not the appearance of a terraced row. In any event, I am not aware of the particular circumstances of any of the cases and I must consider the appeal scheme on its own merits. Therefore, the existence of these other schemes does not alter or outweigh the harm that I have identified above.
9. Even though the proposal would make efficient use of land, I conclude that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area and would be contrary to policies CS08 of the Core Strategy<sup>1</sup>, DM15 of the Development Management Plan<sup>2</sup> and paragraph 127 of the Framework<sup>3</sup>. These policies and guidance require development to respect and enhance the local character and built environment, by sympathetic and sensitive scale, massing and layout.
10. Although not given as a reason for refusal by the Council, Policies CS02 and CS06 of the Core Strategy are referenced by the appellants in support of the appeal. However, this proposal would not comply with these policies, as they require development in Key Rural Service Areas to maintain the local character.

### **Other Matters**

11. I have taken into account representations about traffic and the future use of the property, but these are matters which do not affect my findings on the main issue.
12. The appellant references the lack of an objection from the Parish Council. However, this does not outweigh the harm I have identified or set a precedent for this development.

### **Conclusion**

13. For the reasons detailed above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*D Hilton-Brown*

INSPECTOR

---

<sup>1</sup> King's Lynn & West Norfolk Borough Council, Local Development Framework - Core Strategy, Adopted Version July 2011.

<sup>2</sup> Borough Council of King's Lynn & West Norfolk, Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan, Adopted September 2016.

<sup>3</sup> Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local Government, National Planning Policy Framework, February 2019.