



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 May 2024

**by Ian McHugh DipTP MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 19<sup>th</sup> June 2024**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/V2635/D/23/3332260**

**10 Homefields Road, Hunstanton, PE36 5HJ**

- 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 Ms B Slessor against the decision of Kings Lynn and West Norfolk Borough Council.
  - The application Ref 23/01224/F, dated 8 June 2023, was refused by notice dated 8 September 2023.
  - The development proposed is to replace fence on top of wall at front of property.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether the appeal proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Hunstanton Conservation Area (CA).

### Reasons

3. The appeal property is an end-of terrace dwelling located on Homefields Road. It has a relatively large garden at the side of the property, bounded by a relatively low stone wall with brick detailing. Consequently, the garden is open to public view.
4. The site is within the CA and a distinctive characteristic of the locality is the boundary walls, which are generally similar in materials and height to the wall at the appeal site. In my opinion, these make a positive contribution to the CA.
5. The proposal is to erect a trellis fence behind the wall, which would provide an element of privacy and security for the appellant. I have given weight to these benefits in my decision. I also note that a fence previously existed along the frontage. However, as that is no longer present, it has little influence in my assessment.
6. Policy DM15 of the Council's Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan 2016 requires new development to protect and enhance the amenity of the wider environment, including its heritage value. In addition, Policies CS05 and CS08 of the Council's Core Strategy 2011 seek to enhance the character of Hunstanton and protect and enhance the historic environment. These policies are also reflected in Policies J1 and K2 of the

Hunstanton Neighbourhood Development Plan 2020-2036 and in Chapter 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2023.

7. I note that the Council has advised that security and privacy could be provided by installing railings or planting, but the appellant has dismissed these due to the costs and timescales involved.
8. According to the officer's report, the proposed fence would project above the existing wall by 0.6m. Whilst this projection would be relatively low, I consider that it would appear as an alien and discordant feature that would be visually harmful and at odds with the prevailing character and appearance of this part of the CA. Consequently, the proposal conflicts with the policies and provisions of the Development Plan, as referred to above.
9. With regard to paragraph 208 of The Framework, I consider that the proposal would amount to less than substantial harm to the significance of the CA. Accordingly, the harm should be weighed against any public benefits arising from the proposal. In this case, whilst increased privacy and security are benefits to the appellant, they are not public benefits and, therefore, they do not outweigh the harm that I have identified.

### **Conclusion**

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

*Ian McHugh*

INSPECTOR