



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 April 2023

by N McGurk BSc (Hons) MCD MBA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 09 May 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/Y2620/D/23/3315862

Chawton, Market Street, Tunstead, Norfolk, NR12 8RB

- 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 Jason Lee against the decision of North Norfolk District Council.
 - The application Ref PF/22/2640, dated 9 November 2022, was refused by notice dated 6 January 2023.
 - The development proposed is demolition of flat roof garage, side extension and conservatory; single storey rear extension to dwelling; replacement roof with higher ridge level and altered shape with 3 dormers to front and dormer and rooflights to rear to provide accommodation within roof space; 2 storey extension to front elevation; changes to external materials; detached single garage to rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. Planning permission was granted¹ in September 2022 for a similar development to that proposed. In this regard, the appellant states that "the proposal was identical to the current appeal proposal. However, during the assessment process, the case officer requested that the plans be amended to reduce the size of the proposed porch extension. The appellant acceded to this request and permission was granted...the sole issue in this appeal is whether the revisions to the front porch extension are acceptable in planning terms."

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal property comprises a detached brick-built bungalow with a hipped roof. The bungalow has been extended to the side and rear.
5. The appeal property is located within a residential area. It forms part of a row of detached bungalows along the same side of Market Street. On the other side

¹ Reference: PF/22/1116.

of Market Street, there is a regular rhythm of similar pairs of semi-detached two storey dwellings separated by pairs of semi-detached bungalows.

6. Dwellings on both sides of Market Street are set back from the road behind substantial gardens and parking areas and have gardens to the rear. This and the presence of grass verges, hedgerows and trees, provides for a sense of greenery and spaciousness.
7. The above qualities also contribute to a significant sense of uniformity. Further, the low height and modest appearance of bungalows along one side of the road and the regularity and spacious form of development on the opposite side of the road results in dwellings appearing comfortable in their plots, as well as a pattern of development whereby no individual dwelling draws undue attention to itself.
8. The recent permission referred to above would, amongst other things, provide for first floor living accommodation. The proposal the subject of this appeal would add a double height porch to the front elevation.
9. I find that this would introduce a feature that would, due to a combination of its height, width and forward projection, appear incongruous and unlike any other form of development along Market Street.
10. The scale and form of the proposed porch would lead it to appear out of proportion with the significantly smaller approved dormer windows and would, I find, result in the proposed porch appearing to unduly dominate the front elevation to an overbearing degree.
11. Further, a mismatch between eaves height would result in an awkward relationship between the permitted dormers and the proposed porch, adding to the incongruous appearance of the proposal.
12. The harm arising from the above would be exacerbated as a result of the prominent siting of the proposed porch, whereby its incongruous appearance would draw attention to itself from a wide variety of locations along Market Street, to the detriment of the identified qualities of the area.
13. Taking all of the above into account, I find that the proposed development would be detrimental to the area's identified attributes. This would be to the harm of the character and appearance of the area, contrary to the NPPF and to North Norfolk Local Development Framework Core Strategy (2008) Policy EN4, which together amongst other things, seek to protect local character.

Other Matters

14. In support of the proposal, the appellant suggests that the porch "echoes" the design of front gables to properties on the opposite side of Market Street. However, I find that the proposal bears little resemblance to the appearance of these existing gables and would not "echo" their appearance to the extent that the harm identified above would be mitigated to any meaningful degree.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons given above, the appeal does not succeed.

N McGurk

INSPECTOR