
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 August 2020

by Jonathan Price BA(Hons) DMS DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 August 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/U2615/W/20/3247357

Land adjacent to 34 Beccles Road, Bradwell, Great Yarmouth NR31 8DQ

- 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 Miss J Frisby against the decision of Great Yarmouth Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 06/19/0319/F, dated 27 May 2019, was refused by notice dated 19 August 2019.
 - The development proposed is new chalet bungalow with car spaces and new vehicular access to existing property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a bungalow and occupies a corner plot at the junction of Mallard Way onto the main Beccles Road. This dwelling, and those sharing the same drive running closely parallel to the main road, all have relatively short back gardens. The proposal is for the back garden of No 34 to provide a plot for a small, two-bedroom chalet bungalow fronting onto Mallard Way. This would be sited in line with the side of the host bungalow and be provided with a road access to two parking spaces at the front.
4. Beyond the proposed chalet is a row of quite closely spaced houses which are set further back from Mallard Way. To the rear of these are the dwellings extending along Robin Court, which back onto those along Beccles Road. The housing in this quadrant is of a relatively mixed character, set quite closely together behind generous front gardens but without particularly long back ones.
5. The proposal is an equivalent arrangement to that where a new dwelling was permitted at the rear of 326 Beccles Road. Here a chalet plot was provided at the start of Lynn Grove, similar to that proposed in this case onto Mallard Way. The main difference is the somewhat more spacious character of the housing at this other location, with dwellings with longer gardens backing onto school playing fields.

6. Although a similar arrangement to that at No 326, I am not bound to repeat this earlier decision and must consider this proposal on its own merits. The proposed chalet would leave No 34 with no back garden and have little depth to its own. Whilst the housing here has a less open character than that at Lynn Grove, the proposal would still appear cramped and out of keeping with the prevailing arrangement of dwellings, which are mainly set back quite centrally within plots much larger than that provided for the chalet.
7. For the above reasons, this proposal would detract from the currently quite spacious character of this area of housing, where the cramped appearance of the new dwelling would be unsympathetic with its surroundings. As a result, the proposal would not meet the requirements of Policy HOU7 of the 2001 Great Yarmouth Borough-Wide Local Plan for new residential development. This is permitted only where not significantly detrimental to the form, character and setting of the surroundings. This policy remains consistent with the aims of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) to achieve well-designed places and ensure that developments add to the overall quality of an area.

Conclusion

8. The dwelling proposed would be sustainably located within a suburban area and close to shops, schools and other facilities, making a small but positive contribution towards boosting housing supply. However, the adverse impacts in respect of character and appearance would significantly and demonstrably outweigh these benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole. As a consequence, I conclude the appeal should be dismissed.

Jonathan Price

Inspector