



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 May 2022

by Philip Mileham BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13TH May 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/V2635/D/22/3296744

8, Holt Court, Walpole St Peter, PE14 7NY

- 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 & Mrs Des and Luisa Calton against the decision of King's Lynn and West Norfolk Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/01809/F, dated 14 September 2021, was refused by notice dated 2 March 2022.
 - The development proposed is 2 side extensions, demolition of garage and new boundary wall with gate.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The proposed development includes 2 side extension and the demolition of a garage. There is no dispute between the parties in respect of these elements of the proposal, and as a result, my decision focuses on the proposed new boundary wall and gate.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is a detached single storey dwelling with a mixture of boundary treatments adjacent to the footpath. Holt Court is characterised by single storey detached dwellings which have predominantly low front boundary treatments. These result in the area having a generally open feel which makes a positive contribution to the overall character of the area.
5. The proposed development would introduce a new boundary which would be approximately 1.5 metres high comprising of full height pillars with a solid rendered base with timber slats above. The overall height of the proposed fence combined with its significant length along the boundary of the site would result in a stark boundary which would jar with the generally lower and more open boundary treatments elsewhere in Holt Court.
6. The design of the proposed boundary would include horizontal slats which the appellant considers would not result in a solid fence. Whilst the horizontal slats would not result in a completely solid fence, the limited gap between the slats would nonetheless result in the significant reduction in the intervisibility of the

host property from Holt Court. As a result, the proposed boundary would create an increased sense of enclosure to this part of the street reducing the sense of openness and thereby harming its character.

7. My attention has been drawn to other tall boundary treatments elsewhere in Holt Court as justification for the proposed development. Whilst I noted that No.10 Holt Court has an approximately 2 metre high close board boundary fence, this only covers a short length along the frontage of its' host dwelling. As such, it is significantly shorter than the proposed development and therefore does not result in the same sense of enclosure and reduction in openness as the proposed development. Whilst the adjacent property has a brick retaining wall with an approximately 1.5 metre high railing above it, the railing has wide spacing which allows visibility of the frontage of the dwelling, retaining the sense of openness in the street scene. Due to their lesser impact than the proposed development, these nearby examples are afforded limited weight in my decision.
8. The appellant considers that the proposed fence is necessary in order to provide privacy to habitable rooms facing Holt Court and to conceal the heating oil tank in the front curtilage of the property. Although the host dwelling is sited closer to Holt Court than many of the properties in the street, there is still an acceptable distance between the dwelling and the footpath. Furthermore, as the site is near the end of the cul-de-sac, there would be very limited opportunities for any significant amount of passing views into the property from pedestrians or vehicles. As such, I consider that the scale of harm to the openness of the street scene by virtue of the proposed boundary treatment would outweigh these concerns.
9. In light of the above, I conclude that the proposed development would result in harm to the character and appearance of the area. As a result, it would fail to accord with Policies CS06 and CS08 of the King's Lynn and West Norfolk Borough Council Core Strategy (2011), and Policy DM15 of the King's Lynn and West Norfolk Borough Council Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan (2016) which state that the strategy for rural areas is to maintain local character and a high quality environment, that new development is required to respond to the context and character of places and that scale, height, massing of materials should respond sensitively and sympathetically to the local setting and pattern of adjacent streets.
10. The proposal would also fail to accord with paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which seeks to ensure that development adds to the overall quality of the area and are sympathetic to local character.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Philip Mileham

INSPECTOR