
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 January 2020

by R Sabu BA(Hons) MA BArch PgDip ARB RIBA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 February 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/F2605/W/19/3239542

5 Park Lane, Scarning NR19 2LD

- 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 Neil Parsons against the decision of Breckland District Council.
 - The application Ref 3PL/2019/0265/F, dated 11 March 2019, was refused by notice dated 24 April 2019.
 - The development proposed is dwelling and associated parking.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. Since the planning application was determined by the Council, the Breckland Local Plan (November 2019) (LP) was adopted. I have therefore had regard to the adopted policies only rather than the former development plan policies cited in the Council's reasons for refusal.
3. I note that an incorrect drawing number is cited in the decision notice. The Council has confirmed that it determined the application based on drawing number 3460.01C and I have assessed the appeal on this basis.
4. I note that the appellant's statement of case states refers to the planning application being outline. However, the wider evidence indicates that the application was made in full and I have assessed the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

6. Park Lane is a residential street generally characterised by two storey dwellings of varying ages with ample spacing that offers views to the open countryside beyond. Although a number of properties have been extended, the area nevertheless retains a spacious character and appearance. While I note the spacing of dwellings in the wider area such as on Shipdham Lane, given the location of the appeal site on Park Lane, the site has a closer relationship to this street rather than other roads in the area.

7. The proposed dwelling would be two storey and would occupy a gap between two existing dwellings along Park Lane. The spacing on either side of the proposed dwelling would be limited and appear significantly smaller than other gaps between dwellings on Park Lane such that the spacious character and appearance of the area would be greatly diminished.
8. Furthermore, the proposal would result in a narrower plot and a private amenity space that would be significantly smaller than others along the street such that the development would be contrary to the prevailing pattern of development of Park Lane.
9. Consequently, the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the area. Therefore, it would conflict with LP Policy COM 01 which seeks among other things development that responds appropriately to, and is completely integrated with, the existing layout of buildings. It would also conflict with LP Policy COM 03 which seeks among other things private amenity space for the occupiers of proposed dwellings that is in keeping with the character of the immediate surrounding areas. In addition, the scheme would conflict with paragraph 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework in this respect.

Other Matters

10. I note local concerns including those relating to privacy, car parking, highway safety and congestion as well as the planning history of the site. However, these points have not altered my overall decision.

Planning Balance

11. I note the benefits of the proposal including energy conservation, sustainable construction and levels of comfort. There would also be temporary economic benefits during the construction phase. However, given that the development is for one dwelling only, these benefits would be limited.
12. I acknowledge the lack of substantial harm with respect to amenity space, overshadowing and privacy as well as the site's location within Scarning Settlement Boundary. I also note that the materials, roof lines and ridge height of the proposal would be similar to nearby dwellings. However, these are neutral factors and do not weigh in favour of the development.
13. I note comments regarding the Council's position in terms of housing supply. However, since the Council has recently adopted its LP, it is reasonable to conclude that it is now able to demonstrate a five-year housing land supply. Nevertheless, taking the appellant's best position as a benchmark, given the significant harm to the character and appearance of the area as well as conflict with the development plan as a whole, and the limited benefits that would arise from the proposal, the adverse impacts of the proposed development would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above the appeal is dismissed.

R.Sabu INSPECTOR