



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 8 June 2021 by Emma Worby BSc (Hons) MSc MRPTI

Decision by Decision by Martin Seaton BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1 July 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/Y2620/D/21/3270714

1 Bramble Close, Mundesley, Norfolk NR11 8NF

- 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 Richard Wiseman against the decision of North Norfolk District Council.
 - The application Ref PF/20/1585, dated 10 September 2020, was refused by notice dated 17 December 2020.
 - The development proposed is alterations to roof structure to create new external balcony with access via external staircase.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issues

3. The main issues in the appeal are:
 - the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area, and
 - the effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring dwellings in relation to loss of privacy and noise and disturbance.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Character and Appearance

4. The appeal site is occupied by a single storey detached dwelling, located in the cul-de-sac Bramble Close, which is made up of a number of similarly styled properties. The wider surrounding area possesses undulating ground levels and a mixture of property appearances and roof types. The proposal would alter the existing hipped roof structure and introduce a balcony, with external access via a staircase with a glass balustrade surrounding.
5. Although a large part of the roof form would remain as existing, the introduction of a gable on one side would result in an unbalanced appearance with the rest of the dwelling. It would also conflict with the other existing roof forms in Bramble Close which are relatively uniform in appearance at present. I

recognise that it would be set back from the front elevation of the property and slightly shielded by the existing front gable and landscaping, however it's elevated nature would make it a highly visible and prominent feature from the road and the track to the side of the dwelling, as well as from surrounding properties.

6. The terrace of the balcony would have a flat roof appearance, akin to some properties in the area and the proposal would not increase the footprint or the height of the dwelling. However, the extensive use of glass, the unbalanced roof form and the large external staircase would appear out of keeping with the host dwelling, which is modest in form and traditional in appearance. This would further add to the incongruous and visually prominent impact of the development on the streetscene.
7. For the reasons above, I consider that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area and therefore would conflict with Policies EN2 and EN4 of the North Norfolk Core Strategy (2008). These policies collectively seek to protect the special qualities and local distinctiveness of the area, with high quality development which is suitable for the context within which it is set. The proposal would also conflict with the general design objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework along with the North Norfolk Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2008) which requires the effect on the character and appearance of the host property to be given consideration.

Living Conditions

8. The balcony would be located on the north eastern side of the existing building and, due to its height, would offer elevated views of the surrounding properties, many of which are also bungalows. Although all neighbouring properties may have sufficient separation distance from the appeal property as recommended by the North Norfolk Design Guide 2008, this distance would apply to the windows to facing habitable rooms. It would not prevent or shield any views into these neighbouring dwellings afforded to the users of the proposed balcony or any perceived loss of privacy due to its use.
9. This includes the rear garden of 21a Paston Road which, although possessing a lower boundary fence and being across the road from the appeal site, would still be overlooked by the balcony due to its elevated positioning. The balcony would also be in close proximity to the neighbouring bungalows on East Cliffe, facing the front elevation of No.8 and the side elevation of No.9. This would provide elevated views into the windows of No.8 and the rear garden of No.9 which would be more significant than the current view from those using the road and access track.
10. Views towards 17 Paston Road would be to the front of the house only with ample separation distance between the two. Furthermore, the relatively small size of the proposed balcony would not be able to accommodate large groups gathering in this location. Therefore, any noise and disturbance generated from those using this amenity space would be minimal and not significantly different to if the occupier were to use their garden.
11. Nevertheless, due to the loss of privacy to 21a Paston Road and 8 and 9 East Cliffe, the proposed development would harm the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers and would be contrary to Policy EN4 of the North

Norfolk Core Strategy (2008). This states that proposals should not have a detrimental effect on the residential amenity of nearby occupiers. It would also conflict with the North Norfolk Design Guide (2008) which places importance on the effect of the proposal on the amenities of any neighbouring properties.

Other Matters

12. A number of similar developments in the area have been highlighted by the appellant. In particular a balcony at 19 Paston Road which is in close proximity to the appeal site. However, these examples are different in design to the proposal before me, with the balcony at No.19 set into the roof with limited glazing and no external staircase. I am also not persuaded that the flat roofs to the bungalows on East Cliff could be assessed as directly comparable to the creation of the balcony and do not set a precedent for the proposed development in this appeal.

Conclusion and Recommendation

13. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

Emma Worby

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

14. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Martin Seaton

INSPECTOR