



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 October 2024

by Philip Mileham BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 October 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/V2635/D/24/3351453

9 Sutton Road, Walpole Cross Keys, King's Lynn, PE34 4HD

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Damien Choppen against the decision of King's Lynn and West Norfolk Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/01095/F.
 - The development proposed is the retention of car port.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The evidence submitted with the appeal decision along with my observations on site indicate that the development appears to have been partly completed. Whilst the development that has taken place appears to be representative of the plans, the appeal is determined on the basis of the plans submitted rather than what is currently on site.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal development is located in front of the host property at Number 9 Sutton Road. The area in the immediate vicinity of the development is principally characterised by two-storey detached dwellings, with relatively open front gardens. The front gardens have an open character with a mixture of post and rail fences with some boundary hedges.
5. Several nearby dwellings in near the appeal development have 'L shaped' footprints which include integrated garages. However, there are no examples of dwellings with separate buildings or structures in front of the host properties in this part of Sutton Road. The siting of the development in front of the host dwelling results in a significantly prominent and intrusive feature in the street scene detracting from the generally open character of the front gardens.
6. Views along the highway are not fully open due to the siting of other properties further along Sutton Road closer to the road than Number 9. Nonetheless, the car port results in a significant structure sited closer to the highway than the properties in the immediate vicinity. Furthermore, due to the

development's scale, it would significantly erode the sense of spaciousness of the frontages of the dwellings in this part of the street. The development has a tiled hipped roof and would be partly clad with timber which would add to the sense of scale and bulk of the development. I find the extent of roof plane visible within the street scene combined with the substantial bulk of the car port would result in a highly incongruous feature that would harm the appearance of the area.

7. The appellant has indicated that the development is needed due to existing garage space being occupied by other hobby vehicles. The appellant has also indicated a willingness to accept a planning condition which would retain the car port without the external cladding. However, whilst a condition could reduce some of the bulky appearance of the car port, the significant scale of the development and extent of views of the existing roof-plane would still result in a significantly bulky and alien feature in the street scene. Therefore, I find these factors would be insufficient to mitigate the harm I have identified to the character and appearance of the area.
8. In light of the above, I conclude that the development would result in harm to the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore conflict with Policy CS06 of the King's Lynn and West Norfolk Core Strategy (2011), Policies DM2 and DM15 of the King's Lynn and West Norfolk Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (2016) and Policy 5 of the Walpole Cross Keys Neighbourhood Plan which collectively seek to maintain local character, respond sensitively to the local setting and pattern of streets and be sympathetic to neighbouring properties in terms of size and general design features.
9. The proposal would also fail to accord with paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework which, amongst other things, seeks to ensure developments are sympathetic to local character.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

Philip Mileham

INSPECTOR