
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 August 2017

by R Norman BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

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

Decision date: 01 September 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/F2605/W/17/3173166
97, Redgate, Thetford IP24 2HE

- 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 Drage against the decision of Breckland District Council.
 - The application Ref 3PL/2017/0010/F, dated 4 January 2017, was refused by notice dated 21 February 2017.
 - The development proposed is a single storey detached dwelling adjacent to 97 Redgate, Thetford.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The site currently comprises an area of side garden for the existing dwelling. The site is laid to lawn with some shrubs planted and a picket fence and laurel hedging to the boundaries. The site forms part of a large residential estate with a variety of dwelling scales and designs present. The development would introduce a single storey detached dwelling into the site with its orientation towards the Redgate cul-de-sac which comprises of a group of single-storey dwellings which are relatively uniform in their scale and layout. The development has been orientated to read with this part of Redgate and as such, would have an unbalancing effect on the regularity of the existing layout
4. Furthermore, whilst the dwelling would read with the cul-de-sac part of Redgate, the size of the plot would result in the dwelling being sited further forward of the existing dwellings by a significant amount which would result in a development that would be out of keeping with its surroundings. I do not consider that the presence of forward projecting garages and a variety of boundary treatments and planting in the vicinity would mitigate the harm caused by the siting of the dwelling as the garages are smaller in size and scale and are not located in such a prominent location as the appeal site.
5. The corner plots have ample side gardens, which is characteristic of this part of Redgate. The introduction of a new dwelling into this location would therefore

appear cramped and out of character. Whilst I note that the width of the proposed plot is comparable to some of the dwellings in the surrounding area, the size of the corner plots are typically larger than other plots and as such the development would be out of keeping with the established pattern of development.

6. Given the above considerations, the proposal would result in harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area. As such it fails to comply with Policies DC1 and DC16 of the Breckland Core Strategy and Development Control Policies (2009) which seek to ensure that new development does not have adverse effects on the amenities and characteristics of the area and reinforces locally distinctive patterns of development, and therefore the development plan as a whole. Furthermore, the development fails to accord with the National Planning Policy Framework which expects development to reflect the character of an area and resist the inappropriate development of garden land.

Other Matters

7. I note that the development would have potential to benefit the highway safety of this part of Redgate in terms of visibility. Whilst this would be an improvement, during my visit the visibility at the junction was not unduly restricted and the nature of Redgate as a residential estate did not appear to generate high levels of traffic, nor traffic travelling at high speeds. As such, this would be a limited benefit which would not outweigh the concerns in relation to the effect on the character and appearance of the area.
8. I note that the appellant states that although the Council does have a 5-year housing land supply in place it has had a shortfall in housing delivery. Even if I were to conclude that there is a shortfall in the delivery of the 5 year supply of housing as suggested by the appellant, the adverse impacts of granting permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits that a single dwelling would provide.
9. I consider that the development would be unlikely to result in any harmful impacts on occupiers of the adjoining dwellings. The presence of the existing detached garage would serve to screen the development from the adjoining dwelling to an acceptable level and there would be adequate separation from the dwelling opposite due to the road between the sites. In relation to the existing dwelling on site, the development would be located relatively close to the side elevation and its windows however, the distances would not be dissimilar to other gaps between side elevations in the surrounding area. Nevertheless, this does not outweigh my concerns in relation to the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
10. A number of other local concerns have been raised, including the number of applications submitted previously, loss of views and disruption to existing residents during construction, as well as the existence of a restrictive covenant. However due to my findings above, it is not necessary for me to consider the additional relevant material concerns further in this instance, as they would not alter my overall conclusions on the proposal.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, and having had regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

R Norman

INSPECTOR