

# 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: 28<sup>TH</sup> January 2022**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/Y2620/D/21/3279302**

**Penny Farthing, Cromer Road, High Kelling NR25 6QZ**

- 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 Nigel Godden against the decision of North Norfolk District Council.
  - The application Ref PF/21/0428, dated 14 February 2021, was refused by notice dated 27 April 2021.
  - The development proposed is dormer window extension to east side elevation.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## Preliminary Matters

2. The appellant indicates that the original description of development has changed. Therefore, the above description reflects the amended description shown on the appeal form.

## Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposed dormer on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area; and on the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring property, Ash Vale, with regard to privacy.

## Reasons

### *Character and Appearance*

4. The appeal property is a detached bungalow in a row of dwellings of varied design and appearance running along one side of the A148, with largely open land on the other.
  5. Policy EN4 of the North Norfolk Core Strategy (2008) 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. Extensions should use forms, detailing and materials which are compatible with the original building.
-

6. The appeal property is of asymmetrical design with a central element with a forward-facing gable end flanked by a pitched roof projection to one side and, on the same side as the proposed dormer, a flat-roofed element. As such, the position and flat roof of the dormer would not be uncharacteristic. Moreover, it would be set down from the existing roof ridge, up from the eaves and in from either end of the roof, although it would run for the full extent of the roof face, which is quite extensive due to the depth of the main part of the dwelling.
7. The existing pitched roofs are covered by traditional dark tiles, while the proposed external material for the dormer is timber cladding. While this material is present on the flat-roofed side element, it is subordinate to the principal materials which are render and tiles. The side element is also of considerably lower profile and visibility than the other parts of the existing dwelling due to its position and flat roof. However, the length of the dormer combined with the extent of timber cladding at a raised level would contrast unfavourably with the appearance of the original roofscape, marking the dormer out as a prominent and incongruous addition. As such, it would be contrary to the design guidance in the SPD which expects extensions to use materials that are compatible with the original building.
8. While there is substantive tree cover to the front of the property, the full profile would be visible from the footpath and road, as well as neighbouring dwellings. From these views, the extent of the incongruous appearance of the dormer would be readily apparent.
9. Therefore, for these reasons, I conclude that the proposed dormer would have an unacceptably harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area. Consequently, it is contrary to Policy EN4 of the North Norfolk Core Strategy and to the SPD, as described above.

#### *Living Conditions*

10. The windows in the front face of the dormer would be opposite the side upper floor windows of the neighbouring two storey property, Ash Vale. However, there is a good degree of separation between these properties with planting to the shared boundary. The relationship between the two properties' windows would not be unusual in a residential setting and the extent of separation between them is such that there would be no harmful overlooking and loss of privacy to either the neighbouring dwelling or its garden.
11. For this reason, I conclude that the proposed extension would not be contrary in this regard to Policy EN4 of the Core Strategy, which includes the requirement that proposals should not have a significantly detrimental effect on the residential amenity of nearby occupiers.

#### **Other Matters**

12. I have had regard to the representation made by an interested party. This does not, however, raise any additional matters in relation to the main issues in this appeal that would lead me to reach a different overall conclusion.

#### **Conclusion**

13. I have found in the appellant's favour with regard to one main issue, concerning the effect on living conditions. However, this does not outweigh the

fact that the proposal is contrary to development plan policy as it would cause material harm with regard to its effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area. There are no other material considerations that outweigh the conflict with the development plan. Accordingly, it is concluded that the appeal should be dismissed.

*J Bell-Williamson*

INSPECTOR