



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 July 2020

by P Mileham BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 04 August 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Y2620/W/20/3246775

Land north of East Court, Abbey Road, Sheringham NR26 8HH

- 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 GSM Investments Ltd against the decision of North Norfolk District Council.
 - The application Ref PF/19/0426, dated 11 March 2019, was refused by notice dated 04 October 2019.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a single 2-bedroom detached dwelling and associated works.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site is roughly triangular area of land to the north of East Court and is located on the corner of Abbey Road and Holt Road. The site is currently laid to grass and slopes down towards Holt Road. The site is bordered to the west by a pair of single storey semi-detached dwellings and the surrounding area comprises a mix of both single and two storey detached and semi-detached dwellings which are predominantly set back within their plots. The dwellings in the area have been constructed with a range of different materials and predominantly have pitched and hipped roof styles giving the area a mixed character.
4. The site's position on the corner of Abbey Road and Holt Road and sloping aspect to the north results in a highly prominent position in the street scene. The pattern of development in the immediate vicinity is predominantly for properties which are set back from their boundaries. The proposed development would occupy a significant proportion of the site limiting the space between the dwelling and its boundaries. Due to the constrained nature of the site, the scale and positioning of the proposed dwelling would appear cramped in comparison with the surrounding pattern of development. As such, this would adversely affect the pattern of development and result in a harmful effect on the character of the area.

5. The proposed development would be sited running perpendicular to Abbey Road in close proximity to the boundary with the adjoining footpath. Although the modified boundary wall would allow some separation between the dwelling and the footpath, the proposed development would be much closer to the footpath than most other dwellings in the vicinity. This would starkly contrast with the surrounding properties which are predominantly set further back from the footpaths. As a result, it would result in an increased sense of enclosure to the public realm due to its proximity to the footpath, jarring with the surrounding pattern of development.
6. The proposed dwelling would have a ridge height approximately 400 millimetres higher than the adjacent single storey dwellings (No.5 and No.5A Holt Road). Although the appellants have indicated the site would be excavated in order to reduce the overall height of the proposed development, the increased height when considered against the adjoining single storey dwellings would increase the sense of prominence of the dwelling in the street scene. The North Norfolk Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) states at paragraph 3.4.4 that extreme care needs to be taken to ensure that ridge heights and overall proportions are compatible with adjoining buildings. Due to the compact nature of the site and the relationship with the adjoining single storey dwellings, I consider that the height of the proposed development would result in a highly prominent dwelling that would appear incongruous in the street scene. Whilst it is noted that there are other dwellings that have similar relationships to the nearby flats, the harmful effect of the proposal is exacerbated by the corner position of the site, its gradient and prominence in the street scene.
7. The proposed dwelling would be finished with a combination of materials including white render, clay pantiles as well as timber cladding. In light of the mixed character of the area the palette of materials would broadly accord with the overall character of the area. Furthermore, the positioning of windows and rooflights would avoid overlooking of adjoining properties.
8. The proposed development would make a small but positive contribution to meeting local housing needs, along with the accompanying economic benefit as a result of construction. However, as the proposed development is for a single dwelling, these benefits are very modest and would not be sufficient to outweigh the concerns I have set out above.
9. In light of the above, I conclude that the proposed development would result in harm to the character and appearance of the area. As such, it would be contrary to policies SS3 and EN4 of the North Norfolk Core Strategy (2008) which state, amongst other things, that in residential areas appropriate residential development will be permitted and be suitably designed for the context within which they are set, and that the scale and massing of buildings relate sympathetically to the surrounding area.
10. The proposal would also fail to accord with paragraph 130 of the Framework which indicates that permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality an area and the way it functions.

Conclusion

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

P Mileham

INSPECTOR