



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 November 2024

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

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9 December 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/Y2620/D/24/3345104

Old Chapel Cottage, Stubb Road, Hickling, Norwich NR12 0YS

- 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 Stephen Budgett against the decision of North Norfolk District Council.
 - The application Ref is PF/24/0687.
 - The proposed development is for a single storey front/side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Issue

2. The description of development is taken from the Notice of Decision as it describes the proposal more clearly than the application form or appeal form.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal property is an old detached dwelling of small scale. It is of red brick and flint work with dormer windows and tiled roof. The dwelling lies within a garden plot and is sited perpendicular to the highway. It is within a rural village characterised by a diverse range of dwellings of different ages, architectural styles, design, sizes and orientation to the narrow rural highway.
5. The appeal proposal would introduce a single storey extension to the rear of the plot when viewed from its highway frontage. Due to the perpendicular orientation to the highway, the proposal would be at the dwelling's front and side elevations that are furthest from the highway frontage. The front elevation can be seen when travelling along the highway.
6. The extension would meet some of the criteria within the North Norfolk Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2008) (DGSPD), in terms of materials, size and single storey. It would also be smaller than a previously approved extension (Planning permission reference PF/17/0860). However, I find that the shape and form of the roof of the proposal would result in an awkward junction that would not assimilate comfortably with the original

dwelling. This would be at odds with the DGSPD, as it does not use a roof form compatible with the original dwelling and relates awkwardly to existing window and door openings. The previous consent, although a larger scale, would have assimilated comfortably with the original dwelling in terms of roof design so as not to appear incongruous in the streetscene.

7. The appeal proposal's roof design is poor and thus it would harm the character of the host dwelling. As a result it would also appear incongruous and harm the character of the surrounding area, notwithstanding the eclectic mix of dwellings in the vicinity.
8. Consequently, I find that the proposal conflicts with policy EN4 of the North Norfolk Core Strategy (2008) (LP) and the DGSPD because the development fails to exhibit architectural quality and it has not been well designed in terms of the shape and form of the roof.

Other Matters

9. There are no objections from neighbours or the Parish Council. However, this does not overcome the identified harm caused by the proposal.
10. The appeal proposal would provide additional living accommodation including a downstairs W.C. and shower. However, I do not find these benefits outweigh the identified harm.

Conclusion

11. 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 that would be caused by the appeal development. I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

A Hartley

INSPECTOR