



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 June 2024

by A Hartley, LLB(Hons), Solicitor, MBA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 08 August 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/V2635/D/24/3339885

Sycamore Farm, Chapel Road, Tilney Fen End, Tilney St Lawrence, Norfolk PE14 8JL

- 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 Duncan Jeffcock against the decision of Kings Lynn and West Norfolk Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 23/01840/F.
 - The development proposed is for a ground floor extension and upgrades to the existing property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) has been updated since the appeal representations were made. However, as the revisions do not affect the matters under consideration in this appeal (other than paragraph references) it was not considered necessary to seek further comment.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

4. The appeal property is a former farmhouse and is a characterful two storey red brick property built circa 1960s, with a conservatory. It is set in a large plot comprising mature garden, wooded area and outbuildings. Within the surrounding area are other former farmhouses, and some terraced cottages. The area retains a rural character. Although it is not listed, or in a conservation area, the traditional scale, proportions and design of the existing property make a positive contribution to the character of the area.
5. The appeal proposal would introduce a very large extension to the existing property at ground floor level only. In particular, the extent of the canopy that would link the extensions at ground floor level would unbalance the proportions of the dwelling so that the first floor would appear very much smaller and

incongruous. Although the materials and finishes proposed are in keeping, the size, design and scale of the extensions when taken as a whole, would adversely affect the existing proportions of the host dwelling. Despite being at the ground floor only, the proposal would not appear subservient to the existing property.

6. Parts of the appeal property are visible from some public vantage points along Chapel Road. Although the Parish Council has stated the proposal would enhance the street scene, I find that harm would be caused to the street scene by reason of the size, scale and design of the proposed extensions. The unbalanced proportions of the first and ground floor would make the host dwelling appear incongruous within those views available of the building. I have taken the mix and size of properties elsewhere along this section of the road into account. However, the presence of these buildings does not alter my judgment that the proposal would be an unsympathetic and discordant addition to the existing dwelling.
7. Consequently, I find that the proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area by virtue of its poor design and inappropriate scale and size, that fails to take account of the existing well-proportioned design of the host dwelling.
8. Accordingly, I find that the proposal conflicts with policies CS02, CS06 and CS08 of the Kings Lynn and West Norfolk Borough Council Local Development Framework – Core Strategy (2011), policy DM15 of the Kings Lynn and West Norfolk Borough Council Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan (2016), and the Framework, all of which seek high quality design appropriate to its context.
9. My attention has been drawn to the benefits of the appeal proposal, including upgrading the energy efficiency, modernising the dwelling and providing additional space for current and future occupiers. However, I do not find that these benefits outweigh the conflict with the development plan in this case.

Conclusion

10. Having taken into account all representations made, for the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposal conflicts with the development plan as a whole. There are no material considerations including the Framework that justify a decision other than one in accordance with the development plan. The appeal should be dismissed.

A Hartley

INSPECTOR