
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 July 2019

by J Williamson BSc (Hons) MPlan MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 October 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/K2610/D/19/3229983

Hoedown, 1 Mill Road, Blofield, Norwich NR13 4QJ

- 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 Glen Bickers against the decision of Broadland District Council.
 - The application Ref 20190451, dated 17 March 2019, was refused by notice dated 2 May 2019.
 - The development proposed is erection of timber garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. During my site visit I observed that the site plan wasn't accurate as the footprint of the existing dwelling was not drawn correctly. Both parties were given the opportunity to comment on this matter. The appellant subsequently submitted a corrected plan and the Council were given the opportunity to comment on this. I consider that the nature and extent of the amendment to the plan does not significantly alter the proposal and that no other parties would be prejudiced as a result of not having had the opportunity to comment on the plan. I have based my decision on the amended plan.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area and flood risk.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal site comprises a semi-detached bungalow with gardens to the front, side and rear. The site is located at the end of Mill Road, close to the junction with Woodbastwick Road. The adjoining semi-detached dwelling, Tamarisk, is located on Woodbastwick Road. The properties are angled at approximately 45 degrees to their respective other neighbouring properties. The host dwelling is set-back approximately 12 m from the highway at its nearest point. These factors create an openness on the corner of Mill Road and Woodbastwick Road. There is a dwarf brick wall and shrubs, averaging approximately 2 m high, along the site's front boundary adjacent to Mill Road and a timber fence,

- approximately 1.8 m high, on the boundary of the site and its neighbouring property, 3 Mill Road. The site is located within a residential area.
5. The neighbouring properties, along the section of Mill Road between the site and a local primary school east of the site, are detached bungalows. Except for No 3, these properties have garages that are attached/integral to the dwelling or sited to the rear. There is a single, detached garage at No 3, with a hipped, dual-pitched roof, constructed of materials that match the dwelling, sited in its front garden.
 6. Given its size and siting the proposed garage building would be visible from numerous positions on both Mill Road and Woodbastwick Road. It would be highly visible above the boundary fence with No 3 when viewed from a westerly direction towards the site along Mill Road. The garage would be sited uncomfortably close to the front corner of the host property, overlapping its front elevation. The shallow-pitched roof, gable ends, and the materials used would be out of keeping with the hipped design, angle of roof pitch and materials of the host property, and others in the area. The proposed garage would erode the openness on the corner of Mill Road and Woodbastwick Road. As such, the proposal would be a prominent addition in the street scene, out of keeping with the host property and others within the immediate vicinity, which would significantly harm the character and appearance of the area.
 7. I note that the appellant considers that the boundary shrubs and fence will screen the proposed development and that the garage in the front garden of No 3 is higher than the proposal, with no hedges to soften the view. However, I consider that the shrubs and hedge would not adequately screen the proposal. Furthermore, although each case has to be determined on its merits, I consider that the size, siting, design and materials of the garage at No 3 are in keeping with its host dwelling, the street scene and the character and appearance of the area.
 8. Policy GC4 of the Development Management DPD (2015) (DMDPD), Policy 2 of the Joint Core Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk (amended 2014) (JCS), Policy HOU4 of the Blofield Parish Neighbourhood Plan (2016) (BNP) all require, collectively and among other things, for development to: achieve a high standard of design; have regard to and respect the character and appearance of an area, and to respect local distinctiveness. Consequently, I conclude that the proposed development does not accord with these development plan policies. In addition, paragraph 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) advises that decisions should ensure that developments are sympathetic to local character. The proposal does not, therefore, accord with paragraph 127 of the Framework.

Flood risk

9. In reason for refusal 2 the Council assert that no detail of the extent of additional hardstanding has been provided and that the material proposed is concrete. The Council proceed to describe the material of the existing hardstanding and what materials should be used in the event of either the existing hardstanding being replaced and/or extended. The Council comments on the implications for surface water run-off and concludes that the proposal does not accord with policies broadly related to surface water and drainage, climate change and flooding.

10. The evidence provided by the appellant confirms that the concrete material referred to in the application relates to the base on which the proposed garage would be sited, and that this would join the existing hard-standing. Hence, no significant areas of additional hardstanding would be laid. As such, I consider that the surface water run-off resulting from the proposal would be satisfactorily dealt with within the site. Consequently, the proposal would not conflict with Policy 1 of the JCS, Policy CSU5 of the DMDPD, Policy ENV3 of the BNP or policies within the Framework regarding flooding.

Conclusion

11. I have found no harm in respect of flood risk, but this is outweighed by the harm that would be caused to the character and appearance of the area.
12. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal is dismissed.

J Williamson

INSPECTOR