



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 December 2025

by T Bennett BA(Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/F2605/D/25/3374687

20 Atling Way, Attleborough, Norfolk NR17 2NS

- 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 Adrian Hartle against the decision of Breckland Council.
 - The application Ref is PL/2025/0897/HOU.
 - The development proposed is first floor side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for first floor side extension at 20 Atling Way, Attleborough, Norfolk NR17 2NS in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref PL/2025/0897/HOU, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing no AHP 20AWA 01 Proposed Plans Elevations and Site.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those specified on the planning application form and drawing no AHP 20AWA 01.

Preliminary Matter

2. As part of the appeal the appellant submitted a daylight and sunlight assessment. This is a technical document and does not seek to alter the proposed scheme. The Council have had an opportunity to comment on this document and I do not consider having regard to this evidence would unfairly prejudice any party.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed extension on the living conditions of the neighbouring occupiers at No 18 Atling Way with particular regard to outlook and light.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a two-storey detached dwelling which features an existing single-storey flat-roof side extension which extends close to the shared boundary with No 18, a single-storey property. The side elevation of No 18, which faces the shared boundary has three windows.

5. The outlook from these windows is currently towards the blank elevation of the existing single-storey side extension at the appeal property. Consequently, the outlook and amount of daylight and sunlight received by these windows is already restricted. Moreover, two of these three windows serve a toilet and bathroom, and are obscure-glazed.
6. The proposed first-floor side extension would be sited above part of the existing single storey side extension. Although this would result in built form at first-floor being sited closer to No 18, the proposed first-floor extension would remain set back from the ground floor side elevation of the existing single-storey extension.
7. Given the proposed setback and taking into account the existing outlook from the side windows at No 18, I do not consider that the proposed side extension would have a materially overbearing or oppressive impact on the side windows at No 18, over and above the existing situation.
8. I have considered the submitted daylight and sunlight assessment, prepared in accordance with the Building Research Establishment (BRE) guidance Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight: A Guide to Good Practice (BR209). Whilst the Council question the accuracy of the report due to the omission of the side elevation windows at No 18, the absence of them does not diminish my ability to determine whether any overshadowing would adversely affect this specific elevation. The report demonstrates that the increase in built form would result only in a very slight increase in shadowing of the side elevation at No 18, and this impact would only be apparent in the late afternoon. Accordingly, I find that the proposal would not lead to a harmful loss of daylight or sunlight to the side windows at No 18.
9. For the reasons above, the proposed development would not have an unacceptable effect on the living conditions of the neighbouring occupiers having regard to light and outlook. It would therefore accord with Policy COM 03 of the Breckland Local Plan (2023) which seeks to prevent development that causes unacceptable effects on the residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers.

Conditions

10. In addition to the standard time limit for commencement, conditions are needed to define the approved plan in the interests of certainty and to control the external materials to ensure the satisfactory appearance of the development.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, and having had regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

T Bennett

INSPECTOR