
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 February 2017

by Christa Masters MA (hons) MRTPI

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

Decision date: 14 February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/E9505/D/16/3163616

70 Riverside Estate, Brundall, Norfolk NR13 5PU

- 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 David Wright against the decision of The Broads Planning Authority.
 - The application Ref BA/2016/0263/HOUSEH, dated 4 July 2016, was refused by notice dated 6 September 2016.
 - The development proposed is to recover existing exterior cladding with 'A'+ Rated Cellular P.V.C. with increased fire resistance and thermal insulation from "Fortex" the fully sustainable product by "Free Form" as recommended by the building research est. green guide.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted to recover existing exterior cladding with 'A'+ Rated Cellular P.V.C. with increased fire resistance and thermal insulation from "Fortex" the fully sustainable product by "Free Form" as recommended by the building research est. green guide. at 70 Riverside Estate, Brundall, Norfolk NR13 5PU in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref BA/2016/0263/HOUSEH, dated 4 July 2016 and the plans submitted with it.

Procedural Matters

2. The appellant has confirmed that the development has taken place and been completed.
3. A recent appeal decision has been issued at No 50 Riverside Estate¹. I also note the Council have referred to two further appeal decisions². I shall return to these decisions below.

Main Issue

4. The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site comprises a single storey riverside lodge located on the River Yare. The property is located at the southern end of a private road and the

¹ APP/E9505/W/16/3158503

² APP/E9505/D/12/2186568 and APP/E9505/A/13/2191650

area fronting the river is characterised by chalet properties. Beyond this, there are a number of larger scale commercial buildings.

6. As part of my site visit I was able to view the appeal site from both the road frontage as well as the river itself. The appeal property and the neighbouring dwellings are set in relatively uniform plots with access to the river. The properties are similar but not uniform in appearance, with a number of properties varying in height and style. There is also a mixed approach to the fenestration detailing, roof materials and exterior appearance of the properties with some having timber boarding, some plastic cladding, cement fibre boards (at no 71) and some painted render. There is also a variety in the exterior colours used at the properties. Overall, as one would expect, the properties have an overriding riverside appearance.
7. The Council consider that the PVC boarding which has been used to cover the exterior of the property presents a uniform and suburban feature. In my view, the exterior of the property must be considered in the context of the surrounding chalets. From what I saw, I am not convinced that from either the road or river frontage, it would be possible to differentiate the difference between timber exterior cladding and the PVC cladding used. I acknowledge that the cladding would not weather and soften in appearance in the same manner as traditional wood. However, from what I saw on the site visit and given the sites riverside location, a majority of the chalets with timber are well maintained with appropriate wood stain treatment which limits any evidence of weathering. In my view, the chalet at the appeal site has the appearance of well maintained timber cladding in size, depth of planks and the manner by which it has been attached to the property. It is appropriate to its surroundings. I am unable to agree with the Council's view that the cladding has resulted in a uniform or suburban feature.
8. The Council also contend that the material is neither high quality, locally sourced or sustainable. I have no information before me to support the Council's assertion that the product is not high quality. I have not been referred to any development plan policies which specify that materials should be locally sourced. The appellant has however provided detailed information regarding the composition of the cladding, its energy consumption during manufacturing, the thermal insulation qualities and the low maintenance associated with the product. On balance, and based on the information presented, I am of the view that the proposal represents a sustainable product which, in the circumstances of this appeal, is appropriate to the site context.
9. Turning to the other appeal decisions which have been submitted, the recent appeal decision at No 50 Riverside Estate appears to relate to the provision of a replacement dwelling and the use of uPVC windows and doors. This is different to the issue before me. In relation to the two further appeal decisions which have been referred to by the Council, neither of these are located on the Riverside Estate. The decision at Fleggburgh related to the provision of a replacement rosewood conservatory to the side elevation of the property. Whilst I note the Inspectors conclusions regarding the sustainable of the uPVC material proposed, I am not aware of what evidence was presented to that Inspector on this matter. The other decision at Hoveton related to the provision of uPVC windows and doors and a conservatory with living room extension. Here, it would appear that the Inspector considered the effect of these additions in the context of the existing timber walls. Again, this is not

directly comparable to the issue before me. I therefore find that there are limited similarities I can draw between these decisions and the appeal before me. In any event, each proposal must be considered on its own merits as is the case here.

10. I therefore conclude that the proposal does not result in material harm to the character and appearance of the area. It therefore accords with policy DP4 of the Development Management Policies (DPD) 2011 as well as policies BRU1 of the Site Specific Policies Local Plan (LP) 2014. Policy DP4 advises that all development is expected to be of a high quality design which should integrate effectively with its surroundings, as well as reinforcing local distinctiveness. Policy BRU 1 advises that the riverside chalet area will be managed to retain its contribution to the enjoyment and economy of the Broads.

Conditions

11. As the development has already taken place, it is not necessary to impose a time limit condition. As the only plans submitted are a location plan and photographs of the chalet and completed works, a condition specifying the approved details is also not necessary.

Conclusions

12. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

C Masters

INSPECTOR