



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 29 June 2021

by Graham Wyatt BA (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16th July 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/U2615/W/21/3268130

Breydon View, Market Road, Burgh Castle NR31 9EN

- 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 Russell Loades against the decision of Great Yarmouth Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 06/20/0251/O, dated 10 June 2020, was refused by notice dated 5 August 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as a "residential Development of 2 no. single storey dwellings with detached garages and shared access".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The planning application was submitted in outline form with access and layout for consideration. Matters relating to appearance, landscaping and scale are reserved for future determination and I have considered this appeal on that basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this appeal is whether the site is within an appropriate location for the development having regard to the character and appearance of the area and accessibility to services and facilities.

Reasons

4. The appeal site forms a parcel of grassed land that is located between two residential properties known as Breydon View and High View. The site is bound to the front by hedging where it is proposed to create a new access into the site and to erect two single storey detached dwellings with garaging, parking and garden areas.
5. The area is rural in character with open fields and agricultural land surrounding the appeal site. There are a number of sporadic dwellings in the area with the settlements of Bradwell and Great Yarmouth to the east and Burgh Castle to the west. Although the appeal site lies close to other dwellings, it nonetheless better relates to its rural surroundings, to which it makes a positive contribution. The area has a distinctly open and pleasant verdant quality that is reinforced by the presence of mature landscaping within this countryside setting. Whatever its final form, the proposed dwellings, along with the proposed access and areas of curtilage to be given over to the new properties, would fundamentally alter the appearance of the site through its

- suburbanisation. This would erode the rural qualities and openness of the area which would be generally harmful to its character and appearance and would be evident from Market Road.
6. Moreover, it is also necessary to consider the visual impacts of the residential use such as the vehicle movements and parking associated with the development. Items such as fencing, external lighting, domestic cultivation, garden furniture and washing lines for the new dwellings would add to the suburbanising effect. I am not persuaded that the proposal would lead to an enhancement of the area and nor would the presence of other dwellings in the vicinity of the appeal site lessen the harm that I have identified. Also, any new planting would also take a considerable time to mature and cannot be relied upon to remain in perpetuity.
 7. Furthermore, Policy HOU10 of the Great Yarmouth Borough Wide Local Plan (2001 – Saved 2016) (the Local Plan) lists the types of new dwellings that would be permitted in a countryside location, namely those which are essential for an agricultural worker. Policy CS2 of the Great Yarmouth Local Plan: Core Strategy 2013 – 2030 (2015) (the Core Strategy) requires new residential development to be distributed in accordance with the settlement hierarchy, and in the open countryside to restrict this to conversions, replacements and schemes that help meet rural needs. In this instance, I have not been provided with any evidence that the development would satisfy Policy HOU10 or CS2.
 8. Additionally, appeal site is also isolated from the village of Burgh Castle and other nearby settlements such as Bradwell and Great Yarmouth. Services and facilities such as employment, food stores and education are not readily accessible from the appeal site and although there is a bus stop within walking distance, I have not been provided with any details of the frequency of the services provided. Moreover, access to the bus stop and facilities that are closer to the site requires navigating along a 40mph road that does not have a footpath or street lighting. Consequently, it is highly probable that the occupiers of the dwelling would be heavily reliant on the private car to access even basic day to day services and facilities, especially during bad weather, the winter months, or those with children or low mobility.
 9. Thus, for the above reasons I find that the erection of two dwellings at the site would be undesirable due to the relatively poor access to services and facilities, other than via the frequent use of the private car. The development would also result in harm to the character and appearance of the area. It would conflict with Policies HOU10 of the Local Plan and Policies CS1 and CS2 of the Core Strategy which seek, amongst other things, to ensure that new development is in a location that complements the character and supports the function of individual settlements, provides easy access to jobs, shops and community facilities by walking, cycling and public transport and restrict development in the countryside to meet certain needs.

Other Matters

10. The appellant refers to developments at 'Strawlands' and Mill Nurseries' which are considered similar to the development before me. The Council has clarified that Strawlands is located among a cluster of properties and the development at Mill Nurseries sought a replacement dwelling. Thus, there are clear differences between the appeal development.

11. I acknowledge that the appellant wishes to retire into one of the properties so that the small holding can be re-established. An offer is also made to reduce the development to a single dwelling. While noting the benefits that would result in this respect, I do not consider that either individually or cumulatively they outweigh the harm identified above.

Conclusion

12. Thus, I conclude that there are no material considerations of such weight as to indicate that a decision be taken other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

Graham Wyatt

INSPECTOR