



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 November 2024

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

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6 December 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/F2605/D/24/3342122
141 Fairfields, Thetford, Norfolk IP24 1JW

- 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 Krzysztof Saladra against the decision of Breckland Council.
 - The application Ref is 3PL/2023/1205/HOU.
 - The development is for a front first floor extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The effect of the proposal on (i) the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area, and (ii) the living conditions of the occupants of the neighbouring dwelling at No. 143 Fairfields, with particular regard to outlook, daylight and sunlight.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The appeal property is a modest two-storey brick built terraced dwelling within a large residential estate characterised by similar two-storey terraced dwellings with small window openings, forward single storey garages and open frontages. There is a high degree of uniformity of design and appearance retained throughout the estate.
4. The appeal proposal would introduce a first floor extension with a flat roof. It would protrude from the front elevation at first floor level, above part of the front facing garage, and extend above the open garden area across the front of the appeal dwelling. A corner post within the garden would support the external front corner of the extension. The extension would include a finish comprising render and Eternit slate materials. It would be sited approximately 0.58m from the boundary with No. 143 Fairfields.
5. The appeal proposal would by virtue of its design and appearance be highly visible within the street scene. In particular due to the facing materials and flat roof design it would appear as a substantial, incongruous addition at odds with the identified character of the host dwelling and that of the surrounding area.

6. In conclusion, I find that the appeal proposal would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.
7. Consequently the appeal proposal would conflict with policies COM01 and GEN02 of the Breckland Local Plan (2023) (LP), because the proposed extension fails to exhibit architectural quality and has not been well designed.

Living Conditions

8. The appeal proposal would be very close to No. 143, and with its height and position forward of the host dwelling at first floor level it would be unduly overbearing for the occupants of No. 143. This would cause a harmful loss of outlook.
9. My attention has been drawn to a shadow study. However the information is not sufficiently detailed to demonstrate that the size and height of the first floor extension so close to No. 143 would not give rise to an unacceptable loss of sunlight and daylight.
10. I conclude that the proposal would harm the living conditions of the occupants of the neighbouring dwelling at No. 143, with particular regard to loss of sunlight and daylight and outlook. Accordingly, the proposal would conflict with policies COM03 of the LP and paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) as it fails to provide a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

Planning Balance

11. My attention has been drawn to the insulation benefits that might occur as a result of the appeal proposal. However, I do not find that these outweigh the identified harms.

Conclusion

12. For the above reasons the proposal conflicts with the development plan taken as a whole and there are no material considerations including the Framework that outweigh the harm caused by the proposal. I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

A Hartley

INSPECTOR