



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 September 2025

by J Bell-Williamson MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 01 January 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/L2630/D/25/3368065

Orchard Barn, Burgate Lane, Framingham Earl, Norfolk NR14 7NR

- 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 Peter Sunderland against the decision of South Norfolk Council.
 - The application Ref is 2025/0225.
 - The development proposed is installation of one dormer window and one Velux or Velux type window.
-

This decision is issued in accordance with section 56 (2) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 as amended and supersedes that issued on 2 October 2025.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for installation of one dormer window and one Velux or Velux type window at Orchard Barn, Burgate Lane, Framingham Earl, Norfolk NR14 7NR. The permission is granted in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 2025/0225, dated 24 January 2025, 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 the following approved drawings: 1797.01 Rev B (site plan), 1797.02 (plans and section and elevations - rooflight) and elevations for dormer window, dated September 2024.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed dormer window on the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The site of the proposed dormer is a converted agricultural building within a farm complex in a rural setting. The surrounding area is open countryside with sporadic development.
4. Policies DM1.4, DM3.4 and DM3.8 of the South Norfolk Local Plan Development Management Policies Document (2015) and Policy 2 of the Greater Norwich Local

Plan (2024) all require high quality design from development, including protection and enhancement of locally distinctive character and for residential extensions and conversions to maintain or enhance the character of the building.

5. The appeal building is single storey but has a substantive footprint with variable roof heights. The dormer would be of limited size in this context and, therefore, a relatively modest, proportionate addition in terms of the building's overall size. The new window would be positioned to the rear of the front wing of the building close to the road. Due to its position and limited height it would not be visible from in front of the building or approaching it in either direction along Burgate Lane. It would only be seen, therefore, from within the site itself where there is a range of different buildings, hardstanding and other structures.
6. The appellant indicates that the wing of the appeal building on which the dormer would be located is a new build element and that this replaced a former wooden garage/shed. From my own inspection of the building it has limited architectural merit and any original traditional elements that might have been present previously are not readily apparent.
7. Taking these findings as a whole, the dormer window would be a modest and discreet addition to the appeal building, which would not be readily visible or otherwise incongruous in its particular setting. Accordingly, for these reasons, I conclude that the proposed window would not have an unacceptably harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area. As a result, there is no conflict with Policies DM1.4, DM3.4 and DM3.8 of the South Norfolk Local Plan Development Management Policies Document or with Policy 2 of the Greater Norwich Local Plan, as described.
8. The velux window would be a minor addition to the appeal property and I note that the Council's view is that no harm arises from this element of the proposal. I concur with this.

Conclusion and Conditions

9. For the reasons given above it is concluded that the appeal should succeed.
10. Of the Council's suggested conditions I have imposed the standard time condition and, to ensure the proper implementation of the proposal, one requiring development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans.

J Bell-Williamson

INSPECTOR