

---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 April 2016

**by Nick Palmer BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government**

**Decision date: 22 April 2016**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/V2635/D/16/3141929**

**10 Trinity Road, Marshland St James, Norfolk PE14 8JA**

- 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 Mr & Mrs L Douglas against the decision of King's Lynn and West Norfolk Borough Council.
  - The application Ref 15/01401/F, dated 6 September 2015, was refused by notice dated 6 November 2015.
  - The development proposed is extensions and alterations to dwelling.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Main Issues

2. The main issue in the appeal is the effect of the proposed extensions on the character and appearance of the area.

### Reasons

3. The appeal site is situated between the settlements of Marshland St James and St John's Fen End. There is housing development along Smeeth Road between those two settlements. Trinity Road joins Smeeth Road and the first part of the road is characterised mainly by four pairs of semi-detached houses which are set back from the road in large gardens and spaced apart by generous distances. The spacious quality of the gardens complements the openness of the adjacent countryside.
  4. The houses including the appeal property are semi-detached and of simple design with gabled roofs and lean-to single storey side extensions. The parties have advised that the adjacent house at No 8 has been demolished following fire damage. A two storey side extension and a single storey rear extension had been approved at that property and I understand that the property is to be re-built with the approved extension.
  5. The proposed two storey side extension would have a gabled front wall forward of the existing wall and would extend 4 metres to the rear. Its overall depth would be over 10 metres. To the rear the single storey extensions would have a maximum depth of some 8 metres. A gabled front porch extending 2.7 metres from the front of the house would be added. The side extension would be bulky and dominant in the street scene as a result of its depth. When seen
-

from the rear of adjacent properties the rear extensions would add considerable bulk to the existing dwelling.

6. The combined effect of the extensions would be to overwhelm the existing house and to unbalance the pair of semi-detached houses. These effects would be harmful given that this group of houses has a distinct and unified character in relation to the generally open surroundings.
7. No details of the previously approved extension to the adjacent property are before me. The Council advises that it would have a lower ridge line than the main roof and would be stepped back. Although I note the appellants' views to the contrary these aspects would indicate a subservient form to the main part of the house. By contrast the proposed extensions would be dominant in relation to the original dwelling.
8. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework)<sup>1</sup> requires good design as a key aspect of sustainable development, that developments respond to local character and reflect local identity. Paragraph 60 of the Framework states that whilst design policies should avoid unnecessary prescription it is proper to seek to promote or reinforce local distinctiveness.
9. Policy CS08 of the Core Strategy<sup>2</sup> requires high quality design that responds to context and character. Saved policy 4/21 of the King's Lynn and West Norfolk Local Plan (1998) similarly requires that development has regard for and is in harmony with the building characteristics of the locality. For the reasons given the proposal would not accord with those policies or with the Framework.
10. The Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Pre-Submission Document has been subject to examination but has not yet been adopted. Policy DM15 of that document has similar requirements to policy CS08 and saved policy 4/21 in requiring scale, height and massing to respond sensitively and sympathetically to the local setting. However given its status only limited weight can be given to that draft policy.
11. The appellant has provided an example of a two storey gable-fronted extension to a similar property in Emneth. Because the circumstances of each site and proposal vary that example does not alter my conclusions on the main issue. I have taken into account the appellants' need for extra accommodation and the large size of the garden to accommodate extensions. Those matters do not alter my conclusions.
12. For the reasons given I conclude that the proposed extensions would have an unacceptably adverse effect on the character and appearance of the area.

## **Conclusion**

13. For the above reasons I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*Nick Palmer*

INSPECTOR

---

<sup>1</sup> Paragraphs 56 and 58

<sup>2</sup> King's Lynn and West Norfolk Core Strategy (2011)