

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 January 2022

by J Bell-Williamson MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28TH January 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/Y2620/D/21/3283184

6 Manor Walk, Holt, Norfolk NR25 6DW

- 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 Simon Coe against the decision of North Norfolk District Council.
 - The application Ref PF/21/0967, dated 1 April 2021, was refused by notice dated 1 July 2021.
 - The development proposed is 'a small single storey extension to the front of property'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the street scene.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two storey mid-terrace dwelling in a small estate of similar properties and bungalows. Reference is made to an unsuccessful application for a similar form of extension¹. While I note this earlier application, this appeal involves a separate proposal which I have considered on its own merits.
4. Policy EN2 of the North Norfolk Core Strategy (2008) requires development to protect the special qualities and local distinctiveness of the area, while Policy EN4 requires that all development will be designed to a high quality, reinforcing local distinctiveness. The North Norfolk Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) provides guidance on residential extensions. It says that the scale of an extension should ensure that the architectural character of the original building is not harmed and remains dominant; and that extensions are generally best sited at the rear of the property where 'competition' with the original building is less likely.
5. The terrace of which the appeal property is part is highly uniform and unaltered, with paired front doors recessed from a consistent front building line

¹ Ref PF/19/1693.

across the full length of the terrace from Nos 2 to 12. As such, its original design and layout, and the uniform design of the individual dwellings which form the terrace, make a positive contribution to the street scene.

6. While the proposed extension would be relatively modest in terms of height and depth, it would nonetheless break the consistent building line across the frontage in a prominent position in the middle of the terrace. Due to the highly uniform nature of the terrace, it would be an incongruous addition due to its uncharacteristic position in front of the original building line. Moreover, it would harmfully impinge on the open aspect to the front. As such, it would materially alter the original design and planned layout of this part of the estate to its detriment. The incongruous appearance of the extension to the front of the appeal property and in the middle of the terrace would be readily apparent from the public realm and nearby dwellings.
7. The only other visible example of a front extension within the street scene is the conservatory added to No 3, opposite the appeal property. However, No 3 is not part of a relatively long uniform terrace, but is one of a pair of bungalows set back from the adjoining dwellings. Moreover, I am unaware of the circumstances in which this extension was built and it does not in my view represent a positive precedent for the appeal proposal, for the reasons given. Other examples of front extensions referred to by the appellant are not part of the same street scene and, therefore, the effects are not directly comparable.
8. I acknowledge that the proposed extension is intended to create additional living space, including for working from home and that it is not feasible to extend the property to the rear. I note also that neighbouring residents do not object to the proposal. However, these personal circumstances and other matters do not overcome the harm that I have found would result from the proposal.
9. Accordingly, for these reasons, I conclude that the proposed extension would have an unacceptably harmful effect on the character and appearance of the street scene. Consequently, it is contrary to Policies EN2 and EN4 of the North Norfolk Core Strategy and to the SPD, as described above.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given, it is concluded that the appeal should not succeed.

J Bell-Williamson

INSPECTOR