

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 April 2024

by J Bell-Williamson MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 08 May 2024.

Appeal Ref: APP/U2615/D/24/3338533

Holly Lodge, 5 Green Lane, Caister-on-sea, Norfolk NR30 5EW

- 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 Alex Denny against the decision of Great Yarmouth Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 06/23/0783/HH, dated 25 October 2023, was refused by notice dated 31 January 2024.
 - The development proposed is extension to property to create additional bedroom and garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a detached two storey dwelling at the end of a short private residential cul-de-sac running off Caister High Street.
 4. Policy CS9 of the Great Yarmouth Local Plan Core Strategy 2013-2030 (2015) requires high quality design in new development. Policy H9 of the Great Yarmouth Local Plan Part 2 (2021) states that residential extensions will be permitted where they maintain or enhance the character and appearance of the building, street scene, its immediate surroundings and the wider townscape or landscape.
 5. The predominant dwelling type along Green Lane is modest bungalows. The appeal property, by contrast, is a two storey dwelling with a detached garage to the south. The dwelling is laid out on a similar building line to the neighbouring buildings, while the extension would be perpendicular to the host dwelling, creating an L-shaped building.
 6. The size of the extension incorporating the detached garage would be substantive, of similar frontage width to that of the existing dwelling. Despite the lower roof height, the extent of the forward projection from the original
-

frontage would result in the extension being a dominant feature that would not appear subordinate to the scale of the host dwelling. It would also result in a materially larger built form on a plot of limited size. The existing gap between the dwelling and the detached garage provides some visual relief and sense of openness; the infilling of this to the extent proposed would be an overdevelopment of the plot. Moreover, there would be a loss of the openness at the end of the cul-de-sac viewed from the High Street end and approaching down the lane. As such, due to its overall size the extension would be a harmful addition.

7. I acknowledge that the proposed extension is intended to create additional living space, including for car storage. However, these personal circumstances do not overcome the harm that would result from the proposal.
8. Therefore, for the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed extension would have a materially harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. Consequently, the proposal is contrary to Policy CS9 of the Core Strategy and Policy H9 of the Local Plan Part 2, as described.

Other Matters

9. I acknowledge that the appellant may be frustrated with the process involved in pursuing this proposal. However, this matter is outside the scope of this appeal, which is only concerned with the planning merits of the proposal.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given it is concluded that the appeal should not succeed.

J Bell-Williamson

INSPECTOR