



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 October 2019

**by Sarah Dyer BA BTP MRTPI MCMI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 11<sup>th</sup> October 2019**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/L2630/W/19/3231347**

**Site North of 2 Gilbert Close, Alington, Norwich, Norfolk NR14 7NX**

- 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 Raymond Lincoln against the decision of South Norfolk District Council.
  - The application Ref 2019/0093, dated 8 January 2019, was refused by notice dated 11 March 2019.
  - The development proposed is demolition of domestic garage and erection of a 2 storey affordable dwelling.
- 

### 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 appeal site lies within an established residential area. It forms part of the street scene of Church Road between Gilbert Close and Church Meadow. This part of Church Road is characterised by detached and linked detached houses set back at varying distances from the road. The space around the existing dwellings gives this part of Church Road a pleasant, spacious feel. The appeal site has a frontage to Church Road and is occupied by a double garage. As a result of its size and position, the garage building has a very limited effect on the street scene.
4. The design of the proposed dwelling would be compatible with the other houses in Church Road, picking up the eaves and ridge line of No.s 9 and 7. However, in terms of its position on the plot it would not relate well to 2 Gilbert Close (No.2) which occupies a prominent location at the junction of Church Road and Gilbert Close.
5. The limited space which is to be retained for the rear garden to No.2 would result in the new house being very close to the existing dwelling and the building would fill the majority of the space between the rear of No. 2 and the side elevation of No. 9. This would result in the loss of the separation between No. 2 and No.9 and the development would appear cramped and constrained on the site in contrast to the spacing between other houses in the road. Given

the importance which spaces around buildings make to the character and appearance of this part of Church Road, this effect would amount to harm.

6. The appellant considers that the incorporation of a single storey integral garage into the design would provide sufficient separation between No. 2 and the new dwelling. Whilst this element of the design would provide a degree of separation between the two buildings when viewed from Church Road directly facing the site, as a consequence of the relative positions of No. 2 and the new dwelling, this separation would be insufficient to reflect the arrangement of buildings and spaces in the wider street scene, and the cramped feeling would prevail.
7. There is a degree of inconsistency between the location plan and the site layout plan in terms of the allocation of space between No. 2 and the proposed dwelling. This does not have an impact on the relative position of the two buildings and therefore does not affect my conclusion regarding the cramped nature of the development. Furthermore, whilst the Council has referred to the substandard size of the retained amenity space, at the same time as acknowledging the discrepancy between the plans, there is very limited evidence before me to demonstrate that this would have any impact beyond the cramped layout which I have already found to be harmful.
8. I conclude that the appeal scheme would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The development is therefore contrary to Policy 2 of the Greater Norwich Development Partnership Joint Core Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk (2011 amended 2014) and Policies DM3.5 and DM3.8 of the South Norfolk Local Plan Development Management Policies Document (2015). These policies jointly require all development to be designed to the highest possible standards including with regard to townscape, that additional dwellings on sub-divided plots maintain or enhance the character and appearance of the street scene and that development successfully integrates into its surroundings.
9. For similar reasons the development would not conform with the National Planning Policy Framework insofar as it relates to achieving well designed places.

### **Other Matters**

10. My attention has been drawn to an earlier appeal decision relating to the erection of a small two storey affordable dwelling on the site (Appeal Ref: APP/L2630/W/17/3170215). Whilst I have limited information before me regarding that appeal scheme, I note that the Inspector in that case reached a similar conclusion with regard to the impact of the development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area. However, I have determined this appeal on the basis of its own merits.

### **Conclusion**

11. For the reasons set out above the appeal is dismissed.

*Sarah Dyer*

Inspector