
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 August 2020

by I A Dyer BSc (Eng) MIHT

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 August 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/F2605/W/20/3253433

22 Sandy Lane East, Dereham NR19 2ED

- 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 Ms Cody Barnes against the decision of Breckland Council.
 - The application Ref 3PL/2019/1333/F, dated 31 July 2019, was refused by notice dated 3 December 2019.
 - The development proposed is erection of single storey dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the site and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is the side garden of 22 Sandy Lane East, one of a pair of semi-detached houses lying on the inside of a tight bend which forms a corner on Sandy Lane. Sandy Lane is fronted by residential development, predominantly in the form of two storey semi-detached houses, set back from the road behind modest front gardens with more generous rear gardens. Whilst many of the front gardens have been paved to provide car parking, frontages often retain hedges, which soften the boundary and provide a degree of verdancy to the area. Corner plots generally have gardens to the side which create a sense of openness and emphasise the corner.
4. The pairs of semi-detached dwellings with their intervening spaces between them create a visual rhythm along the street, with more generous spacing around corners and junctions.
5. The proposal would introduce a modest single storey dwelling into the side garden of No. 22. The scale of the proposed dwelling would be in sharp contrast to that of the surrounding semi-detached dwellings. Further, the introduction of the building into the space at the corner would disrupt the rhythm of development formed by the semi-detached pairs whilst reducing the sense of openness around the corner.
6. The plot of No. 22 would be subdivided. The building footprints within each of the new plots would occupy a higher proportion of its plot than is typical of the

area, creating a cramped form of development in contrast to the more generous spacing of buildings around it.

7. Further, the creation of a visibility splay to allow safe egress from the proposed parking for the new dwelling would necessitate the removal of a substantial length of hedge. Whilst this, of itself, would increase openness on the corner to a degree, it would open the site to a wider view from the public realm, and emphasise the cramped nature of the layout within the site, whilst the verdancy of the street scene would be markedly reduced.
8. Given the prominence of the corner in the street scene these changes and the discordant elements that they introduce in regard to the rhythm of built form and overall reduction in openness and verdancy would be very noticeable to passers-by and residents of nearby dwellings. In this instance, this dissonance would amount to significant harm.
9. I therefore conclude that the proposal would result in harm to the character and appearance of the site and the surrounding area contrary to the provisions of Policies COM01 and GEN2 of the Breckland Local Plan (2019) which jointly seek, amongst other things, to integrate new development into its surrounding area in a way that reinforces the distinctive local character. Similarly the proposal would be contrary to the aims of those parts of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019) (the Framework) which seek to achieve well-designed places which are sympathetic to local character, including the surrounding built environment.

Other Matters

10. The development would provide benefits in terms of delivering an additional home in a sustainable location to boost housing supply, albeit that a single home would only have a limited benefit. Although the appellant's statement refers to the home being 'affordable', there is no delivery mechanism proposed to secure the home as an affordable home as defined within the Framework. There would be minor benefits to the local economy in terms of short term employment in the construction industry and longer term support to local shops, businesses and facilities. Taken together, and given the scale of development, these limited benefits do not alter my overall conclusion.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons set out above the appeal is dismissed.

I Dyer

INSPECTOR