



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 February 2025

by **S Pearce BA(Hons) MPlan MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12th March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/V2635/D/24/3348044

6 Howards Close, Old Hunstanton, Norfolk PE36 6HR

- 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 S Harding against the decision of King's Lynn and West Norfolk Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 23/01571/F.
 - The development proposed is described as a "2 storey and first floor front extension; rear single storey extension; replacement dormer to rear including increased size".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. Since the determination of the application, a revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published on 12 December 2024 and amended on 7 February 2025. Those parts of the Framework most relevant to the appeal have not been amended. As a result, I consider that there is no requirement for me to seek further submissions on the Framework, and I am satisfied that no parties interests would be prejudiced by my taking this approach.
3. At the time of my site visit work was taking place at the appeal site. For clarity, I have considered the appeal based on the development applied for and the plans submitted with it.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host property and area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property, 6 Howards Close, is located within a cul-de-sac. The orientation of the built form and plot sizes and shapes differ within Howards Close. Moreover, development in the wider area comprises a mixture of forms, house types and materials, including various styles and sizes of dormer windows. Nevertheless, properties within this cul-de-sac have a predominately uniform appearance, with asymmetric roofs, low eaves and small dormer windows.
6. It is noted that No 6 is in a less conspicuous position, at the end of the cul-de-sac. Nevertheless, it is still visible in public and private views, including from Cromer Road and neighbouring properties. While the appeal property has been previously extended and is not in its original form, its frontage still broadly reflects that of

neighbouring properties. Therefore, the uniformity of the properties and the relatively simple, largely unaltered roofscapes within the cul-de-sac, which includes No 6, that contributes towards the character and appearance of the area.

7. The appeal scheme has been amended from an earlier iteration during the planning application process and seeks to provide a modern living environment. The front dormer window is a key feature of the dwelling. Therefore, the proposed works, among other things, seeks to retain this window, albeit at an increase size, and erect a first floor roof extension with a gable end. These elements would not project forward of the appeal property's principal elevation.
8. Although the Council and appellant have worked positively and proactively during the planning application process, the proposed development would considerably extend and alter the existing roof form of No 6. As such, the simplicity of the existing roof would be lost. Moreover, the enlarged dormer window, while setback from the eaves and down from the ridgeline, would be attached to the first floor front extension. This would further exacerbate the bulk of the proposed development on the frontage of No 6.
9. While it is noted that the design of the first floor extension would replicate the gable ends of the properties within the cul-de-sac, it would, nevertheless, introduce a gable end to the frontage of No 6. The design and massing of the proposal would therefore result in a prominent and incongruous form of development that would erode the uniformity of the properties within Howards Close.
10. The appeal site lies close to, but outside of, the Old Hunstanton Conservation Area (CA). The significance of the CA, insofar as it relates to the appeal, is attributed to the historical evolution of the village. The appeal site, due to its siting and appearance within a cul-de-sac in which the built form has a largely cohesive appearance, has a neutral contribution on the setting of the CA. Having regard to the scale, nature and form of the proposal, together with the location of the appeal site within the cul-de-sac and intervening development, I agree with the Council that the appeal scheme would not result in harm to the setting of the heritage asset.
11. Development in the wider area has been drawn to my attention. This includes properties at Kelsey Close, Hamon Close and at the corner of The Big Yard and Golf Course Road, in addition to non-residential buildings, such as the post office, pubs and a hotel and properties which have been renovated or demolished. However, these are situated in different locations within the wider area and, as such, are viewed in a different context to the appeal scheme. In any case, I have determined the appeal on its own merits.
12. The description of development and submitted plans also propose development to the rear of the appeal property. Both main parties state that these elements comprise permitted development and, as such, are not in dispute.
13. For these reasons, the proposed development would result in harm to the character and appearance of the host property and area. This is contrary to Policy CS08 of the King's Lynn and West Norfolk Borough Council Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2011, Policy DM15 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan 2016 and Policy 7 of the Old Hunstanton Neighbourhood Plan 2024. Collectively, these seek to ensure, among other things,

that new development should be of high quality design, respond sensitively and sympathetically to the local setting and respect local character.

Other Matters

14. The appeal site lies close to a Grade II listed building, The Corner House. In accordance with section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, I am required to have special regard to the desirability of preserving its setting. The Council has not raised any concerns in this regard. Given its relationship with the appeal site, and the location and modest amount of development proposed, I am satisfied that the setting of the listed building would be preserved.

Conclusion

15. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would conflict with the development plan as a whole. There are no material considerations, including the Framework, that indicate I should conclude other than in accordance with it. Therefore, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

S Pearce

INSPECTOR