

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 February 2018

by R A Exton Dip URP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20th February 2018

Appeal Ref: APP/K2610/W/17/3181490

Corner Cottage, Mill Street, Horsham St Faith, Norwich NR10 3HW

- 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 Bobbitt against the decision of Broadland District Council.
 - The application Ref 20170489, dated 26 February 2017, was refused by notice dated 24 May 2017.
 - The development proposed is described as partial demolition of single storey extension and sub-division of plot to provide one dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The planning application form does not specify the site address however its location is clear from the plans accompanying the application. In the heading above I have used the site address from the Council's decision notice as this accurately identifies the site.
3. The planning application was submitted in outline form with all matters reserved. However, the plans accompanying the application show the position of an access and parking area. I shall treat these as being illustrative purposes and take account of them accordingly.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on: i) the character and appearance of the area; and, ii) highway safety in the area.

Reasons

Character and appearance

5. Corner Cottage is situated at the junction of Mill Street, Swan Street and Waterloo Road. Nearby development appears to be mainly residential in character but is of varied appearance. Older properties are situated close to the south side of Mill Street and Swan Street. To the south, and on the same side of Waterloo Road as the appeal site there are more modern dormer bungalows set back from the road in plots with relatively wide frontages. On the opposite side of Waterloo Road is a pair of traditional cottages set back from the road in spacious plots. Although the proposed dwelling would be visible from Mill Street and Swan Street it would be most closely related to, and viewed within the context of properties on the eastern side of Waterloo Road.

6. Whilst the appeal site would have a similar frontage width to the dormer bungalows to the south its width would quickly narrow as it extended away from the road. This would create a plot of much more confined proportions than any of those nearby. This in turn would present a very limited scope for the siting and size of any dwelling. Consequently, any dwelling erected on the plot would appear cramped in comparison with nearby development and as a result out of character.
7. Partial demolition of the single storey extension to the rear of Corner Cottage would increase the separation between it and the proposed dwelling. However it would not alter the limited scope for the siting or size of any dwelling that the appeal site could accommodate. Neither would it alter the relationship between the proposed dwelling and properties on the eastern side of Waterloo Road with which it would be most closely related.
8. In light of the above I conclude that the appeal proposal would result in development that would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. Consequently, of the policies drawn to my attention, it would conflict with Policies 1 and 2 of the JCS¹ and Policies GC4, TS3 and TS4 of the DPD². These require development to promote a high standard of design that responds to local character.

Highway safety

9. The Highways Development Management Officer considers that the appeal proposal is not of sufficient potential detriment to highway safety to be able to sustain an objection. Based on my site visit and the indicative access and parking area shown on the plans, I consider that adequate parking and visibility could be achieved for any dwelling. I therefore have no reason to disagree with this assessment. There is insufficient evidence before me to demonstrate the appeal proposal would compromise highway safety in any way.
10. In light of the above I conclude that of the policies drawn to my attention in respect of highway safety, the appeal proposal would accord with Policies TS3 and TS4 of the DPD. These require development to avoid significant adverse impact on highway safety and provide adequate parking and manoeuvring space.

Conclusion

11. Whilst I find no harm to highway safety, the harm to the character and appearance of the area I have identified and the consequent conflict with policy justifies the refusal of planning permission.
12. For the reasons given above, and taking all other matters raised into account, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Richard Exton

INSPECTOR

¹ The Joint Core Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk adopted in 2011 with amendments in 2014.

² The Development Management DPD adopted in 2015.