



# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 January 2024

**by K Allen MEng (Hons) MArch PGCert ARB**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

**Decision date: 8 February 2024**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/V2635/W/23/3325516**

**2 Lynn Road, East Winch, Norfolk PE32 1NP**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
  - The appeal is made by Mr A Chapman against the decision of King's Lynn and West Norfolk Borough Council.
  - The application Ref 23/00057/O, dated 13 January 2023, was refused by notice dated 17 March 2023.
  - The development proposed is for a new residential dwelling.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## Preliminary Matters

2. The Government published a revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) on 19 December 2023. Whilst this made certain revisions to aspects of national planning policy, the provisions in respect of the main issues of this case are largely unchanged. I am therefore satisfied that there is no requirement to seek further submissions on the revised Framework from the parties, and that no party would be disadvantaged by such a course of action.
3. The appeal scheme relates to an outline proposal, with all matters reserved for future consideration. I have considered the appeal accordingly. Plans have been submitted as part of the appeal which indicate how a dwelling could be accommodated on the site. I have taken this plan into account for indicative purposes only.

## Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

## Reasons

5. East Winch is a rural settlement on the A47 surrounded by open agricultural fields. While there is some variation in the distance properties are set back from the highway and the boundary treatments, this area of East Winch consists of linear, road fronting development. The appeal site comprises an area of garden land associated with but physically separate from No 2 Lynn Road accessed via an existing track.
6. Whilst there is no built form between the appeal site and the A47 to the north, it is enclosed by a combination of mature hedges and high-level fencing and does not benefit from a direct road frontage. As such a dwelling in this location would appear as backland development and would fail to replicate the linear, road fronting pattern of development seen in the area. While the dwelling

would be located within the village boundary it would appear incongruous within the immediate context.

7. My attention has been drawn to a number of other planning applications that have been approved within East Winch that the appellant considers to be comparable backland development. However, I have not been provided with any details. As such I am unable to draw any comparisons between these schemes and the appeal proposal before me.
8. Therefore, I conclude that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area. It would conflict with Policies CS06 and CS08 of the King's Lynn & West Norfolk Borough Council Local Development Framework – Core Strategy (July 2011) and Policy DM15 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan (September 2016) where collectively they seek to maintain local character and a high-quality environment by responding sensitively and sympathetically to local setting and pattern of adjacent streets.
9. Similarly, the proposal would conflict with the Framework where it requires that development is sympathetic to local character, including the surrounding built environment and maintains a strong sense of place.

### **Other Matters**

10. I note the comments made during the course of this appeal regarding highway safety and the Norfolk Green Infrastructure and Recreational Impact Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy (GIRAMs). However, as I have already identified harm in respect of the main issue, it is not necessary for me to assess the effect of the proposal on highway safety or undertake an appropriate assessment, as even if no harm was identified, these would be neutral considerations at best and therefore would not alter the outcome of the appeal.
11. The proposal would provide an additional dwelling in an accessible village, where limited minor development which helps to sustain local services is permitted. Whilst the Framework seeks to boost the supply of housing, the social and economic benefits of a single dwelling would be limited. Although I am satisfied that adequate amenity for future and existing occupiers could be provided on site and that the materials and density of development would be satisfactory; this would amount to a lack of harm and would therefore be neutral factors in the determination of this appeal. Overall, these matters do not outweigh the harm identified to the character and appearance of the area above.

### **Conclusion**

12. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposal conflicts with the development plan as a whole and there are no material considerations, including the Framework that would outweigh that conflict. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

*K Allen*

INSPECTOR