



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 November 2017

by D. M. Young BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI MIHE

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

Decision date: 13th December 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/V2635/W/17/3181577

Land rear of Oakland Lodge (fronting Common Road), Lynn Road, Walton Highway PE14 7DB.

- 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 Kevin Peoploe against the decision of King's Lynn and West Norfolk Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 17/00777/O, dated 18 April 2017, was refused by notice dated 4 July 2017.
 - The development proposed is an outline planning application for single building plot for 2-storey detached dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The application was submitted in outline with all matters reserved for future approval. I have considered the appeal on that basis treating the proposed site plan as indicative.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site forms part of the residential curtilage to Oakland Lodge, a large detached property fronting Lynn Road. The site is seen primarily in the context of Common Road and is flanked by residential properties to the north, east and west. Planning permission has been granted for 12 dwellings on the land to the south¹.
5. Walton Highway is identified in the development plan as a Key Rural Service Centre. There is thus no dispute that the principle of a new dwelling is acceptable in this location. The Decision Notice states that the proposed dwelling would be cramped and failing to respect the established character of the area.
6. Walton Highway has a linear settlement pattern with dwellings arranged mainly along Lynn Road and a number of intersecting roads one of which is Common

¹ LPA Ref: 16/00023/OM

Road. Properties in the locality display a variety of architectural styles, including bungalows and two storey dwellings. Although not particularly sensitive in streetscape terms, Common Road is characterised by detached properties that are set back generously from the roadside behind landscaped gardens. Most are well proportioned in relation to spacious rectangular plots. These features combine to give the locality a spacious and semi-rural quality. In that regard, I consider the appeal site contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area.

7. The size and shape of the appeal site is such that a dwelling, whatever its final form, would fill the majority of its plot in marked contrast to the spacious character of its surroundings. It would be tightly constrained by its site boundaries with little 'breathing' space and limited opportunity to provide a meaningful amount of outdoor amenity space or landscaping. It is also likely that the area to the front of the dwelling would be taken up almost entirely by areas of hardstanding for the parking and manoeuvring of cars.
8. Given the limited depth of the plot the dwelling would have a close visual relationship with Common Road. From here the cramped layout would be readily apparent and it would appear as an incongruous and conspicuous insertion into the street scene bearing an awkward relationship with the property to the rear known as 'Amrishar'.
9. I have noted the indicative layout of the approved scheme to the south. However as the layout and appearance have yet to be approved, this development carries little weight in favour of the appeal scheme at this stage. Overall, the size of the dwelling in relation to its plot would be out of character with the established settlement pattern in the area. Consequently, the scheme would conflict with the aims of Policies CS06 and CS08 of the "*Local development Framework Core Strategy 2011*" and Policy DM15 of the "*Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan 2016*". Collectively these seek high quality design that responds to the context and character of places in West Norfolk.

Other Matters

10. I have noted the appellant's comments in relation to housing land supply in the Borough. However even if I were to accept the appellant's view, this would not inevitably lead to the appeal being allowed. The contribution of one dwelling towards addressing this issue, whilst being a benefit, would not outweigh the harm I have identified.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above and taking into account of all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

D. M. Young

Inspector