
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 March 2017

by R W Allen B.Sc PGDip MRTPI

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

Decision date: 30 March 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/F2605/W/16/3162560

Land at Smithson Loke, Toftwood, Norfolk NR19 1GG

- 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 J Smith against the decision of Breckland District Council.
 - The application Ref 3PL/2016/0732/F, dated 9 June 2016, was refused by notice dated 19 September 2016.
 - The development proposed is erection of a single storey dwelling with attached garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal concerns a vacant parcel of land on a corner plot at the end of a cul-de-sac. The plot is bordered on either side by recently constructed detached bungalows which are, along with the remaining dwellings in the cul-de-sac on relatively spacious plots.
 4. The Council places considerable importance on a previous appeal decision for the site from 2010 (*Ref: APP/F2605/A/10/2128020 for erection of two bedroom bungalow*) in which the Inspector found that the proposed bungalow before him, being set back further than either of the neighbouring bungalows, would appear unduly cramped in relation to them when viewed from the cul-de-sac turning head. From my observations at my site visit, I find no reason to take a different view from the previous Inspector.
 5. The appeal before me is broadly similarly positioned on the plot to the previous appeal scheme, but it would be considerably larger. As opposed to seamlessly rounding off the cul-de-sac as the appellant suggests, I find the proposed development would sit rather disjointedly and would appear awkwardly positioned against neighbouring dwellings. The dimensions of the building would result in a considerable quantity of the plot area being consumed by built form, leaving noticeably diminutive external spaces on the plot when compared to surrounding properties.
-

6. I find that the proposed development would be cramped and incongruous with its surroundings, and would be considerably harmful to the character and appearance of the area. That the appeal site is not readily visible from the main highway on Shipdham Road does not alter my findings on the identified harm that would be caused.
7. The proposed development would not accord with policies DC 1 and DC 16 of the Breckland Council Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document 2001-2026 (2009) (Core Strategy). These state that all development should achieve the highest standards in design and must preserve or enhance the character of an area, and that development will not be permitted where there are unacceptable effects on the amenities of the area. Having considered other policies advanced by the appellants in support of their case, including Core Strategy policy DC 2 in respect to appropriate densities, I am satisfied for the reasons given above that the proposed development would conflict with the Core Strategy taken as whole.

Conclusion

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

R Allen

INSPECTOR