



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 February 2020

by S Tudhope LLB (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 February 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/U2615/W/19/3233817

50 and 52 Lynn Grove, Gorleston, Great Yarmouth NR31 8AR

- 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 David Mattison against the decision of Great Yarmouth Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 06/19/0186/F, dated 20 December 2018, was refused by notice dated 28 May 2019.
 - The development proposed is development of land to 50 and 52 Lynn Grove to create a third dwelling and shared driveway to the rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of development is taken from the appeal form as it more accurately reflects the proposal.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal site is part of the rear gardens of 50 and 52 Lynn Grove (Nos 50 and 52); these properties are single storey detached dwellings situated at the end of a cul-de-sac. Lynn Grove contains a mix of dwelling types, styles and sizes but in this part of the street detached and semi-detached, single storey dwellings with modest road frontages prevail. The properties here are situated around a circular turning head each with their own separate access. There is a regularity to the general street scene that is emphasised by the gaps between properties.
5. Despite its single storey nature and hipped roof form, because of its position away from the road frontage at the rear of Nos 50 and 52 and the position of its access, which would dissect the frontages of the donor properties, the appeal dwelling would appear out of character with and disconnected from the street scene. The general pattern of development would be disrupted by the appeal dwelling, including when viewed from the rear of nearby properties situated on Claydon Grove and Burgh Road, where it would appear out of

keeping with its surroundings. The characteristic uniformity of gaps between buildings and individual access arrangements would be lost from this part of the street.

6. I acknowledge that the garden areas of the donor properties are larger in comparison to those of their neighbours at Nos 44, 46 and 48 Lynn Grove and that sufficient amenity space could be provided to serve the donor properties and the proposed dwelling. Nevertheless, the donor gardens are not dissimilar in size and shape to those of other dwellings situated around the turning head. That a dwelling could be accommodated within the space does not of itself mean that its form would be satisfactory. Subdivision of the gardens in the manner proposed would result in an unacceptable spatial relationship with existing residential properties. Consequently, I consider that the proposal would introduce an inappropriate feature to the site that would fail to integrate effectively with the spatial pattern and character of the surrounding built form.
7. For the above reasons I therefore conclude that the proposed development would have a significant harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. Accordingly, the proposal would conflict with saved Policies HOU7, HOU16 and HOU17 of the Great Yarmouth Borough Wide Local Plan 2001 and Policies CS1 and CS9 of the Great Yarmouth Local Plan Core Strategy 2015. Together these policies seek, amongst other matters, to ensure that all new development appropriately responds to the local context and creates attractive places.
8. It would also fail to accord with paragraphs 124, 127 and 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which emphasise the importance of securing well-designed places that add to the overall quality of the area, are visually attractive as a result of good layout and are sympathetic to local character and appearance.

Other Matters

9. The appellant has drawn my attention to other developments within the area which they consider offer support to the acceptability of the appeal scheme. However, from the details provided, it is clear that these developments do not represent direct parallels to the appeal proposal. In any case, I have considered this appeal on its own merits.
10. In addition, the appellant has referred to the potential for the erection of outbuildings and the provision of hard surfacing that could be carried out at the site under permitted development rights. They consider that this weighs in favour of the development proposed, suggesting that the impacts would be similar. However, despite some parallels in the extent of built form possible, I consider the erection of a new dwelling to be significantly different, in terms of its effect on the character and appearance of the area, than that of ancillary residential development, and I therefore give this matter limited weight and it does not override the harm which I have identified.

Planning Balance

11. On 13 February 2020 the Government published the 2019 Housing Delivery Test results which identify Great Yarmouth Borough Council as an authority where a buffer is to be applied. I have had regard to this information, but as it is common ground that the Council cannot demonstrate a five year supply of

deliverable housing and paragraph 11 d) of the Framework is engaged, it has not been necessary for me to seek further comments on this matter.

12. I acknowledge that the proposal would make a small contribution to the supply of housing in a sustainable location. The proposal would provide a limited amount of short-term employment during the construction phase and by the support for services from future occupiers. I have concluded, however, that the proposal would be unacceptably harmful to the character and appearance of the area and therefore contrary to the environmental objective of planning. I find that this adverse impact of the development would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, as set out above, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole. The proposal would be contrary to the development plan and this conflict is not outweighed by other material considerations including the Framework.

Conclusion

13. For the above reasons the appeal is dismissed.

S Tudhope
Inspector