



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 July 2020

**by P Mileham BA (Hons) MA MRTPI**

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

**Decision date: 17 July 2020**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/Y2620/W/20/3245559**

**Land east of Reephams Road, Reephams Road, Briston NR24 2LJ**

- 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 Tim Berwick and Mr James Berwick against the decision of North Norfolk District Council.
  - The application Ref PO/19/1400, dated 24 July 2019, was refused by notice dated 29 November 2019.
  - The development proposed is the erection of a detached dwelling and garage (outline with all matters reserved).
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Procedural matters

2. The proposal is made in outline with all matters reserved for future consideration and I have determined the appeal on that basis.
3. The Council has amended the description of the development to omit the repetition of the site address and to refer to the scheme being in outline. There have been no concerns raised by the appellant, and as such, in order to avoid confusion with the above banner heading I have adopted the Council's description.

### Main Issue

4. The main issue is whether the proposed development would be in a suitable location for new housing having regard to local and national planning policies.

### Reasons

5. The appeal site is an area of grassed paddock with mature tree and hedge boundaries to the sides and rear. To the front of the site adjoining Reephams Road is a verdant hedge boundary which includes an access gate.
6. The site is located towards the outskirts of the village and outside the settlement boundary as defined in the adopted North Norfolk Core Strategy (2008) ('the NNCS'). As such, the site falls within Policy SS2 of the NNCS relating to development in the countryside even though it may be part of the wider settlement of Briston.
7. The site is bordered on either side by residential properties, and there are properties on the opposite side of Reephams Road. As such, it would not result

in an isolated dwelling in the context of paragraph 79 of the National Planning Policy Framework ('the Framework').

8. Briston and the adjoining village of Melton Constable are classified as a Service Village in Policy SS1 of the adopted NNCS and have a range of services and facilities. The site itself is on the outskirts of the village and although it is still within the 30 miles per hour speed limit, it would nonetheless be around 1.2 kilometres from a bus stop. The appellants indicate that notwithstanding the distance of the site to public transport opportunities, the proposal would allow for cycling or walking into the village. However, there is no footway, cycleway or streetlighting in this part of Reepham Road and the nearest piece of footway is a considerable distance to the north further into the village. The road itself is relatively narrow and passing traffic may need to slow down or stop in order to pass or negotiate pedestrians or cyclists. Furthermore, although there are grassed verges adjoining the road, walking would likely take place in the road itself when the verges may be wet or muddy. As such, these factors significantly detract from the likelihood of future occupiers walking or cycling into the village to access services.
9. Having regard to the above, I consider future occupiers of the proposed development would likely rely heavily on the use of private motor vehicles to access services and facilities in the village or in higher order settlements. Furthermore, the cumulative effect of allowing developments in locations such as the appeal proposal would be likely to increase the number of journeys made by private vehicles, which would over time, amount to a considerable number of trips and would be at odds with the development plan.
10. There is disagreement between the parties as to whether the Council can demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply. The appellant has indicated that a number of sites should be removed from the Council's land supply due to concerns with their delivery timeframes which if done so, would result in the number of years supply falling below 5. However, the Council has further reviewed the appellants position and provided further information on the delivery of sites, including confirmation of a reserved matters approval and expected delivery of dwellings within 5 years for a large site that was the subject of disagreement (Council's reference F01). Therefore, whilst there is disagreement on the likely delivery of a number of sites, I consider the Council's land supply position would be greater than 5 years, and as such, in this instance the tilted balance would not be engaged.
11. The appellants have drawn my attention to other appeal decisions which they consider support their position. In the appeals at Moat Farm Barns, Ipswich (appeal reference APP/W3520/16/3144431) and Land East Side of Green Road, Woolpit (appeal reference APP/W3520/W/18/3194926), the Inspectors conclusions turned on the Council's land supply position and in the Woolpit case the Inspector considered key policies were to be inconsistent with the Framework. As I have not found the Council's land supply position to be below 5 years in this instance nor policies inconsistent with the Framework, these cases are only afforded limited weight.
12. The appellant considers the proposed development would provide benefits in terms of the contribution of future residents to the vitality of the village, benefits to the economy via construction and supply chain jobs and through the payment of Council Tax. However, the benefits associated with construction

would only be temporary. The contribution to vitality of the village and to Council Tax would be very limited due to the proposal being for a single dwelling.

13. Therefore, even if I were to find that the Council does not currently have a 5 year land supply as indicated by the appellant, for the reasons set out above I consider that the adverse impacts of the proposal arising from harm in relation to whether the proposed development would be in a suitable location for new housing would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits. The benefits would also be very modest commensurate with the provision of a single dwelling.
14. In light of the above, I conclude that the proposed development is not in a suitable location for new housing having regard to local and national planning policies. As such, it would not accord with Policies SS1 and SS2 of the adopted NNCS which seek to focus new development on a number of designated Service Villages and in the countryside limit development to that which requires a rural location.
15. The proposed development would also not accord with paragraph 78 of the Framework which seeks to locate housing where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities.

### **Conclusion**

16. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*P Mileham*

INSPECTOR