

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 January 2021

by David Spencer BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 26th January 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/K2610/W/20/3259341

56 Colindeep Lane, Sprowston, Norwich NR7 8EQ

- 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 Matthew Cook against the decision of Broadland District Council.
 - The application Ref 20201222, dated 11 March 2020, was refused by notice dated 17 August 2020.
 - The development proposed is erection of a dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in the appeal is the effect of the appeal proposal on the character and appearance of the locality.

Reasons

3. No.56 Colindeep Lane is a two storey semi-detached house located towards the northern end of Colindeep Lane close to where it joins Edwards Road. Whilst housing along Edwards Road and the cul-de-sac arrangement of Edwards Court to the east provide a moderate degree of enclosure, it nonetheless remains that the layout of No.56 including its deep rear garden is characteristic of the prevailing spacious pattern of development along the eastern side of Colindeep Lane. There are occasional outbuildings within these rear garden areas, including within No.56 and the adjacent No.54 Colindeep Lane, but these do not significantly affect the predominantly open character of these gardens.
4. Whilst the proposed dwelling would be single storey and generally not visible from the public highway it would nonetheless introduce a sizeable footprint and mass of development into this undeveloped and generally tranquil backland area. It would have a very poor relationship to the pattern of development described above, resulting in an oddly positioned and somewhat disconnected dwelling. The proposed unusual tandem layout to the rear of No.56 would be accentuated by the proposed access immediately adjacent to the side and rear of the existing dwelling at No.56.
5. The appellant submits that a similar sized building could be constructed under permitted development rights. That may well be broadly the case for an ancillary outbuilding which would be of a different character and form to an independent residential dwelling. Such an ancillary building would not require the complex off-street parking and access arrangement as the appeal proposal. It would also not introduce the same level of independent domestic activity

that would adversely affect the secluded character of the long private rear gardens of this part of Colindeep Lane. I therefore give negligible weight to the asserted fall-back scenario having a comparable impact to the appeal proposal on the character of the rear garden areas in this part of Colindeep Lane.

6. The submitted plans propose the removal of a modest timber outbuilding in the rear garden of No.56 and the attached side garage to the dwelling. These would not overcome my concerns about the harm arising from the intrusion of an anomalous independent dwelling positioned considerably beyond the clear rear building line in this part of Colindeep Lane.
7. The front areas of residential properties on Colindeep Lane are generally characterised by a combination of front garden and typically 1 or 2 off-street parking spaces. This openness and the greenness of front gardens makes a positive contribution to the spacious suburban character of this part of Sprowston. There are occasional examples of dwellings where the front area is predominantly occupied by off-street parking including current arrangements at No.56. These are, however, noticeably at odds with the prevailing appearance.
8. The appeal proposal would formalise the layout of parking to the front of No.56 such that despite space for some modest landscaping it would otherwise be largely given over to parking spaces including on the site of the demolished garage building. Whilst the local highway authority has not objected to the proposal in terms of highway safety, in relation to the main issue of this appeal the front and side of No.56 would be harmfully dominated by parked vehicles including those from the appeal dwelling. This harmful arrangement, including the uncharacteristic degree of disconnection between the appeal dwelling and its parking spaces, would reflect the fact that the width of the plot at No.56 is insufficient to conventionally accommodate an additional dwelling and any associated ancillary parking and access.
9. I therefore conclude that the appeal proposal would have a significantly harmful effect on the character and appearance of the locality. It would be contrary to Policy 2 of the Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk Joint Core Strategy 2014, Policy GC4 of the Broadland Development Management Development Plan Document 2015 and Policy 2 of the Sprowston Neighbourhood Plan to 2026. Collectively these policies promote good design including, amongst other things, appropriately responding to the local context, reinforcing local distinctiveness and managing the layout of on-plot parking to maintain the 'open and green feel' of the streets in Sprowston. The proposal would also conflict with the fundamental objectives of the planning and development process to create high quality places and secure developments that add to the overall quality of an area, as set out at paragraphs 122, 124 and 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework.
10. I have taken into account all other matters raised but nothing leads me to conclude other than the appeal should be dismissed for the reasons given.

David Spencer

Inspector.