



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 September 2024

by A.Graham BA(hons) MAued IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8 October 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/V2635/D/24/3344022

11 Feltwell Road, Southery, Norfolk PE38 0NR

- 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 and Mrs B Norton against the decision of Kings Lynn and West Norfolk Borough Council.
 - The application Ref: 24/00298/F dated 19 February 2024 was refused by notice dated 12 April 2024.
 - The application is for construction of a 2 storey side extension, internal alterations and the erection of a 1.5m high boundary fence.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a fairly typical red brick mid twentieth century semi detached house. A date stone to the centre of the block records the date of construction as 1935. The appeal property sits within a small development of similar houses that line the main road here. Although the houses are typical of their age this row is notable due to the lack of large extensions and the intact original materials that remain clearly visible. The hedge around the appeal site is also a typical feature of such properties.
4. The proposal before me seeks permission to extend the property with a two storey, pitched roof side extension, so as to create a new living room to ground floor and en suite bedroom above. The extension would be generally flush with the front façade of the house but would set in slightly to the rear. There would also be a small drop to the ridge of the proposed roof when compared to the existing due to this rear set back. The proposal seeks to render the building so as to presumably make the structure appear as a uniform entity.
5. In assessing this application, I am aware of the Council's policies CS08 and DM15, both of which reflect the National Planning Policy Framework (The Framework) in their aspiration to achieve well designed new development that responds positively to an area's character and distinctiveness.

6. The proposal before me however would introduce a harmful alteration to what is actually, at present, a fairly uniform and distinctive row of semi detached houses. As mentioned above the original character of many of these buildings remains and the date stone to each house is a notable feature. Despite this the proposal before me would badly erode these existing design features through both an extension that would not be subservient to the main dwelling and through the use of extensive render that would introduce a harmful element of asymmetry and would lose the whole, or perhaps part, of the date stone between the site and its neighbour.
7. The loss of greenery to the boundary would also appear harmful due to the loss of landscape features that would typically be associated with such a semi detached property.
8. The Planning Officer has found some harm through the proposed scale, height and massing of the proposed extension upon the amenity of neighbours. However, I am unable to ascertain how the matters outlined in the Officer report relate to the actual living conditions of neighbours as these appear more related to character and appearance, matters of which have been addressed above.
9. After visiting the site, although the proposed extension would protrude over a corner plot, I do not consider that the introduction of such a built feature in this location would necessarily cause harm to the nearest neighbours around this site. As such I find no conflict with the Development Plan in this regard.
10. Ultimately however, although I consider that, in principle, there would be ways to extend this property that could result in a suitable design and would improve energy efficiency, the scheme before me is the one that I am obliged to determine. Based therefore upon the designs before me I conclude that although the scheme would not affect the living conditions of neighbours, it would introduce a harmful, dominant and insensitive intervention into the environment here which would bring it into conflict with Policies CS06 and CS08 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy aswell as Policy DM15 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan 2016. As a result this appeal must fail.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, and taking into account of all other matters raised, I dismiss the appeal.

A Graham

INSPECTOR