



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 1 December 2020

by L Fleming BSc(Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3rd December 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/L2630/W/20/3255998

2 Gilbert Close, Alington, Norwich NR14 7NX

- 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 Raymond Lincoln against the decision of South Norfolk District Council.
 - The application Ref 2020/0164, dated 27 January 2020, was refused by notice dated 25 March 2020.
 - The development proposed is demolition of domestic garage and erection of a single storey two bedroomed bungalow (dwelling).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on the:
 - character and appearance of the area
 - living conditions of the future occupants of the proposed dwelling with particular regard to outlook and light

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal proposal would replace a detached garage in a residential area characterised mainly by detached and linked detached dwellings set back from the road with spaces between the buildings. Overall, the area has a spacious residential character and appearance.
4. An appeal was dismissed in 2019¹ for a dwelling on the same site where it was found the limited space which is to be retained for the rear garden to No 2 Gilbert Close (No 2) would result in a new house being very close to the existing dwellings and the building would fill the majority of the space between No 2 and the side elevation of No 9 Church Road (No 9). Furthermore, the development would appear cramped and constrained on the site in contrast to the spacing between other houses in the road.
5. Even though the proposal before me is single storey and would replace an existing single storey garage, it would occupy a much larger footprint than the garage it would replace. The proposed dwelling would be positioned closer to

¹ Appeal Decision APP/L2630/W/19/3231347

the road than the existing garage increasing its prominence and would be set in a long and narrow plot close to its side boundaries.

6. I acknowledge the intentions to make the proposed dwelling appear in similar proportions to the existing garage. I note the double hipped roof and the intended proposed planting would lessen its impact on the street scene.
7. However, the proposal would appear as a new self-contained dwelling not a garage. That dwelling would be of contrasting scale and form to other dwellings in the area and would occupy an uncharacteristically smaller plot than the properties nearby with limited space around it. Consequently, even though I acknowledge the significant amendments made through this and previous schemes, consistent with the Inspector's findings in 2019, I find the proposed dwelling would appear cramped and noticeably at odds with the prevailing pattern and character of the development in the area.
8. For these reasons the proposal would harm the spacious character and appearance of the area and conflict with Policy 2 of the Greater Norwich Partnership Joint Core Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk (2011 amended 2014) and Policies DM3.4 and DM3.8 of the South Norfolk Local Plan Development Management Policies Document (2015) (DMPD). These Policies, taken together require good design and that new development does not harm the character and quality of an area. For the same reasons it would also conflict with the good design aims of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Living conditions

9. I acknowledge No 2 is located next to where the proposed new dwelling would be and is a large two storey property. However, the proposed dwelling would have an open plan kitchen, dining and living area served by openings on three sides including a large door which would look out on to an area of private garden. Overall, there is no substantive evidence to suggest the occupants of the proposed dwelling would not have access to reasonable amounts of natural light and a reasonable outlook.
10. Thus, I find there would be no harm to the living conditions of the future occupants of the proposed dwelling with particular regard to outlook and light. In this regard the scheme would therefore accord with the aims of Policies DM3.13 and DM3.5 of the DMPD which seek to ensure new development does not harm living conditions.

Other Matters

11. I acknowledge a new dwelling would be provided in an accessible location assisting to meet the housing needs of the area. However, this does not outweigh the harm I have identified. I have considered the example of development referred to as 3 Cherrywood, however, this scheme is not before me, it does not have the same context as the appeal site nor does it impact on the character and appearance of the immediate area relevant to this case. I also note the comments with regard to the Council's handling of this and previous applications. However, I have determined the appeal on its planning merits only.

Conclusion

12. Whilst I have found no harm to living conditions, I have found harm to the character and appearance of the area. Thus, on balance, having had regard to all other matters raised, I find the proposal would fail to accord with the development plan and the appeal should therefore be dismissed.

L Fleming

INSPECTOR