



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 April 2025

by **S Simms BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 June 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/V2635/W/24/3357384

Willow Dale, Winch Road, Gayton, King's Lynn PE32 1QP

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant approval to details reserved by a condition of a planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr D Garrard against the decision of King's Lynn and West Norfolk Borough Council.
 - The application ref. 24/00614/RM sought approval of details reserved outline planning permission ref. 20/01422/O, granted on 11 October 2021.
 - The application was refused by notice dated 12 July 2024.
 - The development proposed is Reserved Matters Application for the appearance, landscaping, layout and scale of one dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The outline planning permission reserved the matters of appearance, landscaping, layout and scale, all of which are dealt with in this appeal.

Main Issues

3. The main issues in this appeal are the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area and whether the proposal would provide a suitable standard of living conditions for future occupiers.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The site is part of the garden of a detached 1970s bungalow on a residential road with Victorian houses to the north featuring driveways and lower plot ratios, while newer houses to the south have smaller gaps and higher plot ratios. The site is part of one of the wider plots and is bordered by rather smaller rear gardens to the south and what would be the retained bungalow garden to the east and north.
5. The reserved matters proposal would present a relatively high gable adjacent to a bungalow, on a street more typically fronted by eaves. It would fill a much higher proportion of its plot width with built form than most in the area, which would also be near the rear boundaries of dwellings with short gardens.
6. In combination, this would lead to a cramped appearance, harmful to the character and appearance of the area and contrary to Policies LP18 and LP21 of the King's Lynn and West Norfolk Local Plan, which require development to recognise and reinforce local context and character.

Living conditions

7. The proposed dwelling would take up a significant proportion of the plot, leaving only small gaps to either side, down one of which pedestrian access to the door would be taken. The plot ratio would be at the higher end of the range in the area, manifest in a relatively limited outdoor amenity space.
8. The size and siting of the building close to the boundaries of the proposed plot and neighbouring dwellings limits the areas of the side and rear elevations in which windows could be inserted whilst ensuring adequate privacy. As a result, one bedroom would have only rooflights, so that it would have light but no outlook.
9. In combination, these features would provide unacceptable living conditions, contrary to Policy LP21 of the King's Lynn and West Norfolk Local Plan, which would refuse development of a poor design, and the relevant sections of the National Planning Policy Framework on achieving well-designed places.

Other Matters

10. I note that Natural England did not object, subject to contributions to recreational impact mitigation as the site is within the Zone of Influence of one or more European designated sites. I have taken into account the assessment and evidence of payment of the required contribution.

Conclusion

11. The Government's objective is to significantly boost the supply of housing, and the proposal would provide one new dwelling on land at relatively low risk of flooding within the development boundary of a settlement, with the social and economic benefits that would bring.
12. However, I have identified harms in relation to the effects of the layout and scale of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area and the standard of living conditions they would provide for future occupiers. These harms outweigh the benefits associated with the development.
13. I conclude that the proposal would therefore conflict with the development plan as a whole and there are no other considerations, including the Framework, that outweigh this conflict. Therefore, for the reasons outlined above, I conclude that the appeal is dismissed.

S Simms

INSPECTOR