



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 May 2024

by Ian McHugh DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19th June 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/V2635/D/24/3336800

10 Branodunum, Brancaster, Kings Lynn, PE31 8AL

- 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 Richard Wilson against the decision of Kings Lynn and West Norfolk Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 23/01310/F, dated 14 July 2023, was refused by notice dated 9 November 2023.
 - The development proposed is a two-storey extension and alterations to dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the streetscene.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a detached single storey bungalow, which is situated in a prominent position on a residential estate. The property sits at the end of a short row of bungalows, but the wider estate comprises a mixture of single storey and two storey properties. This includes two storey dwellings beyond and at the rear of the appeal property.
4. The proposal is to construct a two-storey extension at the side and front of the dwelling, plus various alterations, including new windows and doors. Part of the extension would be built on an existing undeveloped landscaped area at the side of the property.
5. The Council considers that the proposal would conflict with Policy CS08 of the Core Strategy 2011, Policy DM15 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan 2016, and with Policy 2 of the Brancaster Neighbourhood Plan 2015 – 2026, because of the extension's size, scale and height. The Development Plan policies generally require new development to respond to local character and the pattern of development and to be of high-quality design. These also accord with paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2023 (The Framework), which contains similar requirements.
6. In reaching my decision, I have carefully considered the appellants grounds of appeal and I acknowledge the existence of other two storey structures in the

vicinity of the appeal site (as detailed in the appellant's statement) and the fact that the development will not occupy more than 50% of the site area. During my site visit, I also viewed the extensions at 5 Roman Way and at 12 Branodunum, which have been drawn to my attention.

7. However, each proposal should be considered on its merits and, in my opinion, the proposed extension would be an overly dominant and bulky addition to the bungalow and it would appear as an incongruous and discordant feature in the streetscene. This part of the streetscene also has a relatively spacious appearance, due partly to the open landscaped area at the side of the appeal property. The partial reduction of this space would also be harmful. Consequently, I consider that the proposal would conflict with the provisions of the Development Plan and The Framework, as referred to above.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given above, it is concluded that the appeal be dismissed.

Ian McHugh

INSPECTOR