



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 January 2021

by S D Castle BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28/01/2021

Appeal Ref: APP/L2630/D/20/3261716
27 Howe Lane, Poringland NR14 7LQ

- 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 Daniel Self against the decision of South Norfolk District Council.
 - The application Ref 2020/1282, dated 19 July 2020, was refused by notice dated 25 September 2020.
 - The development proposed is extending on top of the existing kitchen/bathroom, and extending out (front) 1.8m to return into the existing porch. Upstairs will create bedroom 4 and another bathroom with an ensuite added to existing bedroom 1 and opening up a larger space in bedroom 1. The walls will be brick work to match existing.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The Council's decision notice describes the development proposed as 'first floor front and side extensions, including front infill extension to ground floor.' This is a more clear description of what is being proposed and I have accordingly dealt with the appeal based on this revised description.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a 2-storey, hip-roofed semi-detached dwelling located on the eastern side of Howe Lane. Whilst there is a mix of dwelling styles on Howe Lane, no 27 forms part of a run of 10 pairs of semi-detached dwellings of similar architectural design. Many of the dwellings within the run have been extended, including to the side at first floor level and at ground floor level to the front. No 27 includes single storey elements to the front and side. Notwithstanding the previous extensions and alterations to this run of dwellings, they retain much of their distinct original design. This consistency of architectural form and the set-back of these dwellings behind their open frontages gives the lane a spacious and harmonious character.
5. The proposed first floor front extension would include a hipped roof facing the highway. Whilst it would not project further forward than the existing front extension, it would be significantly taller and more substantial. Furthermore,

neither the ridgeline of the front or side extension would be set down from the existing main ridgeline and the roof angles of the proposed front extension would not match the existing roof angles. Consequently, the proposal would give rise to a prominent feature that would be significantly at odds with the current appearance of both the appeal property and the attached property at no 25. The proposal would harmfully disrupt the symmetry of no 27 and its attached counterpart by causing a more significant and incongruous imbalance to their front elevations.

6. I have had regard to the variation in house types, previous extensions and alterations to dwellings on Howe Lane drawn to my attention by the appellant. The proposal would, however, be out of kilter with the smaller scale of the existing ground floor front extensions found on Howe Lane. Furthermore, the run of 10 similar pairs of semi-detached dwellings, of which the appeal property forms a part, is of significant length and is therefore integral to the character of the area. As such, given the proposed extension would appear as an awkward addition to this run of dwellings, it would be to the detriment of the identified harmonious character of Howe Lane.
7. The proposal would, therefore, harm the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the surrounding area by virtue of its dominant, obtrusive and incongruous design. Accordingly, it would conflict with Policies DM3.4 and DM3.8 of the South Norfolk Local Plan Development Management Policies Document (2015) which, taken together, amongst other things, require development to achieve high quality design which maintains or enhances the character and appearance of buildings, the street scene and surroundings. It would also, therefore, be contrary to paragraph 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework which requires developments are sympathetic to local character and add to the overall quality of the area.

Other Matters

8. I have had regard to the concerns of the Parish Council regarding the impact of the proposal on the living conditions of the attached property. This matter was identified and considered within the Council officer's report. The Council did not conclude that the effect on the living conditions of the neighbouring properties represented a reason to justify withholding planning permission. I have been provided with no substantiated evidence which would prompt me to disagree with the Council's conclusion on this matter.
9. I understand the appellant's frustrations with the restrictions experienced during the application process due to the Covid-19 pandemic. This is not a case, however, where the Council prevented or delayed development which should clearly have been permitted having regard to the development plan, national policy and other material considerations.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons above, the appeal is dismissed.

S D Castle

INSPECTOR