
Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 15 December 2020

by Jonathan Price BA(Hons) DMS DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 December 2020

Appeal A: APP/F2605/W/20/3259281

5 Smithson Loke, Toftwood, Dereham, Norfolk NR19 1GG

- 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 Mr and Mrs J Smith against the decision of Breckland District Council.
 - The application Ref 3PL/2020/0784/F, dated 22 July 2020, was refused by notice dated 4 September 2020.
 - The development proposed is self-build bungalow.
-

Appeal B: APP/F2605/W/20/3259346

5 Smithson Loke, Toftwood, Dereham, Norfolk NR19 1GG

- 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 Mr and Mrs J Smith against the decision of Breckland District Council.
 - The application Ref 3PL/2020/0295/F, dated 15 March 2020, was refused by notice dated 9 June 2020.
 - The development proposed is self-build bungalow.
-

Decisions

1. Appeal A is dismissed.
2. Appeal B is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

3. As set out above, there are two appeals relating to a self-build bungalow on this site. They differ in the design proposed. I have considered each on its individual merits. However, to avoid unnecessary duplication, I have dealt with the two schemes together in this single decision letter.

Main Issue

4. With both proposals, this is the effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. The site lies to the far corner of a rectangular area of land that has been developed to provide four bungalows. This development is located to the rear of the frontage housing along the A1075 and served by a private drive running between this. Access for the new housing plot would be taken off the turning

head to the cul-de-sac and run between the furthest two dwellings. The site backs onto housing estate development and is surrounded by residential town suburbs, and so the principle of a residential use was not in dispute.

6. The appeal A scheme is for a rectangular plan, one-bedroomed bungalow with a mono-pitch, green roof. The roof would slope upwards to the boundary with high-level windows along the rear elevation. The Appeal B scheme is similar but is for a L-shaped unit with two bedrooms. In both cases, the dwelling would be positioned close to the far sides of the plot, providing the main garden and car parking areas to the front, facing the entrance from the cul-de-sac.
7. There have been two earlier appeals dismissed on this site, for a two-bedroomed¹ and a one-bedroomed² bungalow respectively. These current two schemes seek to overcome the concerns with the most recent of these appeal decisions. This is through siting the dwellings back in the plot to provide a more spacious appearance at the front, similar to the bungalows either side.
8. However, in both cases, the new dwellings would be set back beyond the rear elevations of the neighbouring bungalows. Sited deep in the plot and adjacent to the next-door back gardens, with virtually none of their own, both appeal schemes would be out of kilter with the present arrangement of housing in Smithson Loke. In both schemes, the backland position and limited dimensions of the available plot would result in a cramped and incongruously positioned extra dwelling, harmfully out of keeping with the existing, satisfactory housing layout. As a consequence, both appeal proposals would have an adverse impact upon the character and appearance of this residential area, in conflict with policies GEN 02 and COM 01 of the adopted Breckland Local Plan of 2019.

Conclusion

9. Fruit trees that were the subject of a Tree Preservation Order have evidently mostly been removed from the site. However, any actions in this regard would be a matter for the Council. The dwellings in both appeal cases would help meet a demand for self-built plots and accommodation suitable for elderly occupiers, providing also some environmental benefit through incorporating green roofs. The new bungalows would be located near to a good range of services and facilities, with regular household needs capable of being met without recourse to long journeys and private car dependency. However, these quite minor benefits would not outweigh the harm found in both cases to the character and appearance of the area and, as a result, neither of the appeals succeed.

Jonathan Price

Inspector

¹ APP/F2605/A/10/2128020

² APP/F2605/W/16/3162560