

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 February 2022

by P Eggleton BSc(Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3RD March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/L2630/D/21/3288502

5A Highlow Road, Costessey, Norfolk NR5 0HP

- 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 Tristan Gordon against the decision of South Norfolk Council.
 - The application Ref 2021/1395, dated 16 June 2021, was refused by notice dated 25 October 2021.
 - The development proposed is a chalet roof extension to create first floor accommodation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a chalet roof extension to create first floor accommodation at 5A Highlow Road, Costessey, Norfolk in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2021/1395, dated 16 June 2021, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 1335-P-03 and 1335-SK-02.
 - 3) The works hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the description of materials set out in the application form.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect on the character and appearance of the area; and the effect on the living conditions of neighbouring residents with regard to loss of outlook.

Reasons

3. The existing dwelling is a small, detached single storey property with a flat roof. It was originally the double garage to 5 Highlow Road but the council accept that it has a lawful use as a separate self-contained dwelling. When viewed from the street, it currently retains its appearance as a single storey double garage with a flat roof and an attached single storey side addition which also has a flat roof. The land levels fall significantly to the rear requiring a raised terrace to facilitate access from the lower garden area. The property has a very close visual relationship with the original host dwelling.
-

4. Two sets of proposed plans have been provided with the appellant advising that the revision, with the three bedrooms, was submitted to overcome concerns raised by the neighbouring resident. The council have confirmed that their decision relates to drawing 1335-SK-02. This decision relates to that drawing.
5. The proposal would result in a forward facing gable to the front of the dwelling. A pitched roof would extend to the rear and also over the side addition. It would form a rear hipped roof with a centrally located rear dormer window. It would result in a roof that would be more in keeping with the design of the original host dwelling than the existing flat roof. It would have a marginally steeper pitch than its neighbour but it would not appear overly large. It would have different design characteristics such as the forward facing gable, but it would not be at odds with the appearance of the neighbouring dwelling. When viewed from the front, the appearance of the property would be enhanced. Although it would remain closely related to its neighbour, the improved appearance of the appeal property, would enhance the relationship and appearance of the two houses overall.
6. Longer views of the two properties are limited due to surrounding vegetation, boundary treatments and changes in levels. In any event, the relationship of the two properties would be acceptable and would overall enhance the appearance of this original plot within the street scene. The properties along Highlow Road have a variety of designs and positions within their plots. There is no clear rhythm with regard to property heights, positions and spaces between them. This proposal would not significantly alter the existing overall character and would not harm the appearance of this area. It would improve the limited views that exist. Given these conclusions, there would be no conflict with the design objectives of Policy 2 of the Joint Core Strategy (2011 and 2014); or Policies DM1.4 (d)(i), DM3.4 and DM3.8 of the South Norfolk Local Plan Development Management Policies Document 2015 (LP).
7. The council also suggest that the roof of the dwelling would be overbearing with regard to neighbouring dwellings. The property to the north is set at a lower level. Its front building line is forward of the proposal and its rear building line has been extended by a flat roofed extension. The side boundary is made up of a high fence at a high level compared to the neighbouring dwelling. The new roof form would have its eaves marginally above the fence line but set away from it. The new roof would slope away from the shared boundary. This revised relationship would not be unacceptably overbearing. To the rear of the property, the additional height of the roof would add to the significant difference in levels in relation to the neighbouring garden. However, the position of the extension to the rear of that property would limit the potential for the new roof to dominate that rear garden, particularly as the main amenity area is away from the shared boundary.
8. The neighbouring resident raised concerns with regard to shading. The shading details provided indicate that there would be only limited changes with regard to loss of direct sunlight. These details accord with my own assessment. The new structure would be noticeable to the neighbouring residents when in their rear garden and the works required are likely to cause some disturbance. However, these matters are not sufficient to result in unacceptable harm to the living conditions of the neighbouring residents. The proposal would also not result in unacceptable overlooking as the dormer window would be set away

from the boundary and its design would limit many angles of view when within that room. The proposal would not therefore result in harm to the living conditions of the residents of 7 Highlow Road.

9. With regard to the living conditions of the residents of the former host property, the new roof would pitch away from the narrow areas of land between them. These areas do not offer any significant amenity as they provide a relatively narrow access between the dwellings. The very limited outlook from these areas would not be significantly altered and as the proposed roof would be to the north, there would be no loss of sunlight. Overall, there would be no material conflict with the amenity requirements of LP Policy DM3.13(1). As the policies referred to by the council generally accord with both the design and amenity requirements of the *National Planning Policy Framework*, I afford them considerable weight.
10. In conclusion, the proposal would improve the appearance of the dwelling and would be of benefit to the street scene. It would not result in unacceptable harm to the living conditions of neighbouring residents. As there are no other matters that weigh significantly against the proposal, I allow the appeal.
11. I have imposed conditions relating to the commencement of development and the details of the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning. The application form sets out the details of the materials to be used and a condition would require that these details are implemented to ensure that the development would have a satisfactory appearance.

Peter Eggleton

INSPECTOR