
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 March 2017

by Nick Palmer BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

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

Decision date: 30 March 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/K2610/W/16/3166999

Land adjacent 47 Waterloo Road, Hainford, Norwich, Norfolk NR10 3AX

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Andrew Chatten against the decision of Broadland District Council.
 - The application Ref 20161539, dated 30 August 2016, was refused by notice dated 19 October 2016.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a 3 bed bungalow.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The application is for outline permission with all matters reserved. A block plan has been submitted which I have considered as being indicative of a possible layout.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in the appeal is whether or not the proposal would accord with national and local planning policies for housing development, having regard to the character and appearance of the area and the accessibility of the site to services and facilities by sustainable means.

Reasons

4. The appeal site fronts onto Waterloo Road and is between two existing dwellings. It is near the edge of a group of houses in the countryside and the area has a wooded character. The site is outside any settlement limit as defined on the adopted Proposals Map. Policy GC2 of the Broadland Development Management Development Plan Document (DPD) (2015) directs new development to sites within settlement limits and restricts development outside those limits.
 5. The site together with land to the side and rear forms part of an area that is covered by a Tree Preservation Order. As the site forms part of the wider wooded area it provides a landscape feature that contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area. It has not been demonstrated that the development would not adversely affect any of the trees but even if this could be achieved it would have an adverse impact in terms of eroding the
-

- landscape. The proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area in this respect.
6. Policy 16 of the Joint Core Strategy (JCS)¹ identifies Hainford as being suitable to accommodate a limited amount of development but the supporting text to that policy notes that the villages identified have few or no local services and would not provide a sustainable location for significant new development.
 7. The Council has advised that the settlement has a primary school, a public house and a recreation ground and that public transport services are limited. Details of bus services are not before me but it seems to me that the site is quite isolated in terms of its accessibility to services and facilities needed on a day to day basis. The occupants of the proposed dwelling would be dependent on the car to a large extent and it has not been demonstrated that there is any significant level of accessibility by sustainable means.
 8. The appellant intends to rent the dwelling at a reasonable rent but it is not proposed as an affordable dwelling. While the proposal would have the potential to be supportive of the rural community, no specific evidence has been put forward in this respect. The general isolation of the site from services and facilities and reliance on the car for transport would not accord with the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework)². Because the proposal is outside the settlement limit it would not accord with Policy GC2 of the DPD or with Policy 16 of the JCS. The proposal would not accord with Policy 1 of the JCS which requires minimisation of the need to travel.
 9. Policy 3 of the JCS seeks to minimise reliance on non-renewable high-carbon energy and maximise the use of decentralised and renewable or low-carbon energy sources. Reliance on the car for transport would not accord with these aims but given the limited scale of the proposal I find no significant conflict with that policy.
 10. For the reasons given the proposal would not accord with national and local planning policies for housing development. The Council has advised that it has well in excess of the required five year supply of deliverable housing sites and on this basis its policies for the supply of housing are up-to-date.
 11. Policy GC1 of the DPD reflects the Framework in presuming in favour of sustainable development. I have found harms in terms of the character and appearance of the area and isolation from services and facilities. Those harms weigh against the environmental and social dimensions of sustainable development. Any benefit in terms of supporting the rural community would accord with the social dimension but this would be limited and considered as a whole, for the reasons given the proposal would not be a sustainable form of development.
 12. For the reasons given I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Nick Palmer

INSPECTOR

¹ Joint Core Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk (2011/2014)

² NPPF paragraphs 17 and 55