



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 July 2020

by P Mileham BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4th August 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Y2620/W/19/3242841

44 Margaret Lilly Way, Aldborough, Norwich NR11 7PA

- 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 Andy Pegg against the decision of North Norfolk District Council.
 - The application Ref PF/19/1130, dated 04 July 2019, was refused by notice dated 24 September 2019.
 - The development proposed is the raising of garage roof to create additional storage space.
-

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 area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is one of a row of three linked single storey garages attached to No. 44 Margaret Lilly Way which is a two-storey end terrace property. The area is characterised by short terraces of single storey dwellings and semi-detached properties. The short terraces give the area a regular rhythm and relatively uniform grain of development. Adjoining the site to the rear is a large mature tree.
4. The garage that is the subject of this appeal is linked to No.44 Margaret Lilly Way by a single storey porch. There are currently three separate ridge heights associated with the appeal property which include the two-storey dwelling, the single storey porch and the linked garage. The difference in heights between the ridge of the porch and adjoining garage is minimal which provides a general sense of uniformity to the single storey roofline elements which run perpendicular to No.44. The appeal proposal would raise the height of the roof of the garage by approximately 1.45 metres which would have the effect of introducing a fourth separate ridge height in this part of the street scene. This would, as a result, significantly disrupt the uniformity of the ridge line of the garage block by creating an uncharacteristic step effect.
5. The character of the area is defined by the uniformity of both the single storey and two storey terraced properties, along with the continuation of the single storey garage block. The proposed development's disruption to the uniformity

- and step effect would result in an incongruous feature in the street scene, which consequently, would not accord with the character and appearance of the area.
6. The mature tree to the rear of the site makes a positive contribution to the street scene by providing a pleasant green feature to contrast the uniformity of the garage block. The tree partly overhangs the appeal site and no evidence has been submitted to demonstrate that any construction works would not harm the tree. The appellant has indicated that there would be no foundation works or excavation that would harm the tree roots. Nonetheless, I consider that there would be a significant likelihood for the need for the removal of larger branches which would be necessary if the height of the garage roof were to be raised. This could result in harm to the tree, and as a result, the character of the area.
 7. The appellant has indicated that the extension is necessary to provide additional storage for his business which would have an economic benefit. It is also noted that the proposal would not result in any adverse effects on the living conditions of adjoining occupiers and would be constructed in matching materials. The avoidance of harm to the living conditions of adjoining occupiers would be required of any development of this nature, likewise the use of suitably matching materials. As such, these factors would have a neutral effect on the proposal. Whilst the proposed development would have an economic benefit through supporting the appellant's business, this would be minimal due to the scale of the proposal. As such, I consider these factors would not be sufficient to outweigh the harm to the character and appearance that I have identified.
 8. In light of the above, I conclude that the proposal would result in harm to the character and appearance of the area. As such, it would be contrary to policies EN2 and EN4 of the North Norfolk Core Strategy (2008) which state, amongst other things, that development proposals should demonstrate that their location, scale, design and materials will protect, conserve and, where possible, enhance the special qualities and local distinctiveness of the area and design which fails to have regard to local context and does not preserve or enhance the character and quality of an area will not be acceptable.
 9. The proposal would also fail to accord with the National Planning Policy Framework's ('the Framework') design aims including paragraph 130 which indicates that permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area.

Conclusion

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

P Mileham

INSPECTOR