



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 April 2023

by Peter White BA(Hons) MA DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4 May 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/L2630/D/22/3306120

24 Keswick Road, Cringleford, Norfolk NR4 6UG

- 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 and Mrs Andrew and Ani Few against the decision of South Norfolk Council.
 - The application Ref 2022/0460, dated 28 February 2022, was refused by notice dated 9 June 2022.
 - The development proposed is two storey and single storey side extension with pitched roofs.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Background and Main Issue

2. The application for the proposed development follows a similar development approved by the Council (ref: 2021/2421). The principal difference is that the development before me proposes a two-storey element across the full width of the extension, rather than set in from the side.
3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area, with particular regard to the proximity of the first-floor element to the neighbouring dwelling.

Reasons

4. The western side of Keswick Road is characterised by detached houses in spacious grounds. Most retain an element of space between neighbouring buildings at first floor level, and some are set back behind trees.
5. The appeal building is a two-storey dwelling of traditional design, with a hipped roof and front and rear gables. Coniferous hedgerows above brick and stone walls along the street frontage of the appeal building and 22 Keswick Road (No 22) reduce the visibility of ground floor elements. At the same time they frame, and increase the prominence of, the upper parts of the dwellings in the street scene.
6. The existing gap between the properties at first floor level provides space which respects the distinctly different designs of the appeal dwelling and No 22, which stands on the boundary between the properties.
7. The proposed and approved schemes are similar in many respects, but the proposed additional width at first floor level would result in a very close association between the appeal building and No 22. I note that the two-storey

element of the proposal would be set back, but would nevertheless be a visible feature from the street. Given the prominence of the upper floors in the street scene, and the distinctly different designs and materials, the proposed development would unduly reduce the space between the dwellings, and would harm the character and appearance of the area.

8. In conclusion, the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the area, with particular regard to the proximity of the first-floor element to the neighbouring dwelling. Consequently, it would conflict with Policies DM3.4 and DM3.8 of the South Norfolk Local Plan Development Management Policies Document (2015) and Policy 2 of the Joint Core Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk (2014). Together these policies require high quality design which maintains or enhances the character and appearance of the building, street scene and surroundings. It would also conflict with Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which seeks to achieve well-designed places.

Other Matters

9. No 22 is built along the boundary between the properties, but I must consider the development in relation to existing development. Although the appellant advises that the occupants of No 22 are known to the Council's planning officer, I have made my decision as an independent party. The absence of harm in relation to other aspects of the design is a neutral

Conclusion

10. I therefore conclude the development would conflict with the development plan as a whole and the approach in the Framework. There are no other material considerations that require a decision to be made other than in accordance with the development plan, and the appeal should therefore be dismissed.

Peter White

INSPECTOR