
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 February 2021

by Jonathan Price BA(Hons) DMS DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 February 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/K2610/W/19/3242813

Holly Cottage, Pack Lane, Lingwood, Norwich NR13 4PD

- 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 Ms Lisa Hudson against the decision of Broadland District Council.
 - The application Ref 20191510, dated 27 September 2019, was refused by notice dated 4 December 2019.
 - The development proposed is construction of detached dwellinghouse with associated car parking.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The application was made in outline with details of access, layout and scale provided and those of appearance and landscaping reserved for later consideration. I have dealt with the appeal on the same basis.

Main Issues

3. The effects on highway safety, character and appearance and whether acceptable living conditions would be provided for current and future occupiers.

Reasons

4. The proposal is for a detached house next to Holly Cottage. This residential property is along Pack Lane; an unadopted access that serves a varied arrangement of some 15 dwellings and is also a public right of way. The housing in Pack Lane is on the edge of the village of Lingwood but within the settlement boundary. Therefore, the principle of further residential development would be acceptable under Policy GC2 of the Development Management Development Plan Document¹ (DPD). The latter, along with the Joint Core Strategy² (JCS), comprise the development plan.
5. Regarding the issue of highway safety, I have had regard to the appellant's Technical Note³, the local Highway authority's statement and the subsequent rebuttal to that. Consideration has also been given to an earlier dismissed

¹ Broadland District Council Development Management Development Plan Document 2015.

² Joint Core Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk March 2011 as amended 2014.

³ Mode Transport Planning 5 July 2019.

appeal⁴ relating to a residential plot between Holly Cottage and Sunnyside Cottage, the preceding dwelling. In this, the Inspector had found that a further dwelling would have a significant adverse effect on highway safety, due to substandard visibility at the junction of Pack Lane onto the public highway at Chapel Road.

6. There is no dispute over the lack of any recorded road traffic accidents at this location over the past 20 or so years. It is also agreed that a single dwelling would generate a relatively small increase of vehicular usage on Pack Lane, in the order of about six daily two-way trips. The Technical Note was based on automatic traffic counts⁵ and speeds along Chapel Lane.
7. Visibility at the Pack Lane junction onto Chapel Road falls short of the standards recommended in Government's Manual for Streets. Nevertheless, visibility in the more critical traffic direction meets acceptable levels from a reduced setback of 2m, where some vehicles might protrude onto the running carriageway. Regarding visibility in the less critical direction, where vehicles approach along the opposite side of the road to the Pack Lane junction, this is significantly more restricted and substantially below standards relative to likely traffic speeds.
8. In addition to its sub-standard visibility onto the public highway, Pack Lane itself is mainly of a very narrow width, restricting the safe passing of vehicles and lacking adequate turning, passing and pedestrian refuge space. The residual cumulative impacts on the road network of just a single additional dwelling would not be severe. Nevertheless, considering all the above road factors, the proposal would overall have an unacceptable impact on highway safety. Safe and suitable access to the site for all users, and that which minimises the scope for conflicts between pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles, would evidently not be achievable. As such, the proposal would have a significant adverse effect on highway safety and conflict with both DPD Policy TS3 and the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework).
9. In respect of character and appearance, the housing in Pack Lane is of a varied and informal layout and appearance. The appellant argues the scale, form and position of the new dwelling gains support by reflecting the dimensions of a large extension already permitted to the side of Holly Cottage⁶. The permitted large two storey extension would match the height of the existing cottage with roof ridges interconnecting at 90 degrees. Whilst a bulky addition, the extension would integrate satisfactorily with the existing dwelling so as to create a coherent whole.
10. The proposed new dwelling would be akin to a disassembly and small separation of the approved addition. As a separate building, matching the scale and proportions of the permitted extension, the new house would be of a rather ungainly stretched form. Long, mainly unrelieved expanses of walling to either side would provide bland and featureless elevations. The new house would have a cramped and incongruous appearance, detracting from the currently quite spacious character of the housing here. The large areas of side walling would have a rather overbearing impact on the outlook from the rear windows

⁴ Appeal Ref: APP/K2610/A/08/2089443 Sunnyside Cottage, Pack Lane, Lingwood, Norwich, NR7 0DU. Decision date: 19 February 2009.

⁵ ATC data recorded between 23-29 May 2019.

⁶ Council application number 20171451 Two storey side, front and rear extension and alterations to Holly Cottage, Pack Lane, Lingwood, Norwich NR13 4PD.

and garden of the host dwelling, as well as from those of the closely positioned dwelling to the other side.

11. Although the existing and proposed dwellings would have reasonably sized gardens and internal living spaces, providing generally acceptable living conditions for current and future occupiers, the scheme would nonetheless have a harmful impact on the character and appearance of this area. This would be contrary to JCS Policy 2, DPD Policy GC4 and Framework paragraph 127, insofar as these seek new development be of a good design which is in keeping with its surroundings.

Conclusion

12. I have given weight to the fallback position of implementing the approved extension to Holly Cottage. This might alter the character and appearance of the area and also accommodate a larger household, resulting in increased vehicular trips. I accept that a single dwelling would result in only a marginal increase in the usage of Pack Lane, although approval might set a precedent making further development less reasonable to resist. The scheme would be sustainably located within the settlement and provide benefits towards housing supply and to the local economy, through the building work and future household spend.
13. However, for the reasons given, I find Pack Lane unsuitable to serve a further dwelling which, in this case, would also detract from the character and appearance of the area. The harm found for these reasons would outweigh any benefits from a proposal which would conflict with the aforementioned policies and the development plan and Framework both taken as a whole. Therefore, having taken into account all further matters raised, I conclude that the appeal be dismissed.

Jonathan Price

Inspector