



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 22 June 2021

by Paul Thompson DipTRP MAUD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5TH July 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/Y2620/W/20/3263217

52 Aylsham Road, North Walsham NR28 0BL

- 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 John Smith against the decision of North Norfolk District Council.
 - The application Ref PO/20/1081, dated 3 July 2020, was refused by notice dated 27 August 2020.
 - The development proposed is detached two storey dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The planning application was submitted in outline with all matters reserved except for layout and access. I have had regard to the block, location, floor and elevation drawings (Drawing Ref PL04) but have treated each element of the drawing as indicative, apart from the details of the layout and access, when considering the likely impact of the proposal on the matters set out in the main issues below.
3. In its Officer Report and Statement of Case, the Council has raised concerns with respect to the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers, particularly in respect of outlook. However, the details of the scale and appearance of the proposed dwelling are purely indicative. With this in mind, I have determined the appeal only in relation to the concerns identified on the Decision Notice.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are: -
 - the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the site and its surroundings; and
 - whether suitable living conditions would be provided for future occupiers of the proposed house, with regard to daylight and sunlight.

Reasons

Character and appearance

5. The appeal site is situated within a predominantly residential area and concerns the northern end of the rear garden of 52 Aylsham Road, the length and width of which is typical of those to the north of the road. Given that the site would be served by the existing access at the rear taken from Princes Street, it would

have a closer relationship with and be experienced in the context of existing houses in that street. Moreover, Princes Street is formed of pairs and terraces of houses, with hard and soft landscaped frontages. The mid-terrace plots are narrower than end-terraced plots and those associated with the semi-detached houses, as these are set in more spacious grounds with side gardens.

6. The layout of the proposal would leave around one metre of space to either side of the house. While I accept that the width of the existing garden means that a single house would be likely to fill the majority of its width, it is not implicit that this would be acceptable within its context. Moreover, in this case, the proposal would be conspicuous as a cramped form of development that would be in contrast to the neighbouring houses in Princes Street.
7. For this reason, I conclude that the proposed development would have a significantly detrimental effect on the character and appearance of the site and its surroundings. Hence, the proposal would not accord with the design aims of Policy EN4 of the North Norfolk Core Strategy (the CS).

Living conditions

8. The site is oriented on approximately a southwest-northeast axis. The eastern boundary is marked by a tall and dense evergreen hedge, while to the west is a close boarded fence. In the neighbouring garden beyond the fence are several tall mature deciduous trees.
9. The main parties have not provided sun path information for summer and winter months. However, it is likely that there would be some overshadowing of the proposed garden areas and less daylight within parts of the proposed house in the early and latter periods of the day, particularly when the deciduous trees are in leaf.
10. Nevertheless, based on the evidence before me, given that these effects would be likely to be limited for the remainder of the day, I conclude that suitable living conditions would be provided for future occupiers of the proposed house, with regard to daylight and sunlight. Hence, the proposal would accord with the aims expressed in Policy EN4 of the CS in this respect.

Other Matters

11. I accept that the proposed house would be within the development limits of the town, that it could be of a sustainable design and energy efficient construction and that access and parking arrangements would comply with highway standards. Nonetheless, these matters would weigh neither for nor against the appeal scheme.

Conclusion

12. While I have not found harm in relation to the living conditions of future occupiers of the proposed development, I have identified significant harm to character and appearance of the site and its surroundings. Therefore, for the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should not succeed.

Paul Thompson

INSPECTOR