



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 September 2021

by K Winnard LL.B (Hons) Solicitor

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 September 2021.

Appeal Ref: APP/Y2620/D/21/3275970

Primrose Farm Cross Road Skeyton NR10 5AN

- 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 M Heraud against the decision of North Norfolk District Council.
 - The application Ref PF/21/0461, dated 17 February 2021, was refused by notice dated 13 May 2021.
 - The development proposed is a detached 3 Bay car port/garage with annex accommodation above.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of development in the banner heading above is based on that used in the decision notice. I note that this is also the description used by the appellant's agent in the appeal form.

Main Issue.

3. The main issue in the appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. Primrose Farm, the appeal property, is situated within open countryside. Planning permission has already been granted for a detached cart shed garage with annexe accommodation above.¹ The principle of a new car port/garage with annex accommodation of this size and in this location has therefore already been accepted. The present proposal would incorporate dormer windows, French doors and a balcony on the rear elevation from that previously approved. The introduction of such design features would be discordant features in a curtilage building and would not reflect the traditional rural style of such buildings.
5. The appellant's agent has drawn my attention to the North Norfolk Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (Design Guide) which indicates that

¹ PF/20/2017

dormers can enliven roof slopes and are a feature of residential dwellings within North Norfolk. Both the Design Guide and Policy EN4 Design of the North Norfolk Core Strategy also look to encourage high quality modern architecture and indicate that richness and variety make a place special. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) also indicates that design should not be used as a reason for objection to development where the design accords with clear expectations in plan policies. Nonetheless Policy EN4 requires design to have regard to the local context and for development proposals to be suitably designed for the context in which they are set. In this instance, the incorporation of dormer windows, French doors and a balcony in the rear elevation and the introduction of substantial glazing would have the effect of introducing a domestic appearance to a curtilage building. This would be at odds with the functional low key appearance of a traditional curtilage building and would as a result increase its visual dominance.

6. I appreciate that the proposal would be constructed in traditional materials and is of a traditional cart shed design, however aspects of good design are fundamental to all development, as stated in the Framework, and would not represent a notable benefit. The Design Guide indicated that that it should be left to local context to determine what form a building takes. As such I do not find any inconsistency in the approach taken by the Council to the current proposal and that previously approved.
7. My attention has been drawn to other development proposals that have been permitted by the Council. Whilst some elements of the proposal are evident elsewhere, they are of different scales and reflect the type of development permitted. Accordingly, they are not directly comparable with the appeal proposal. In addition, two of the developments referred to are in a neighbouring district and were therefore considered in a different policy context to the current appeal. I cannot be certain of the circumstances in which any of these developments were approved and as such give them limited weight. Besides, each case must be determined on its own merits and the individual circumstances involved.
8. For the reasons given, I conclude that the proposal would harm the appearance of the area. As such it would be contrary to Policies EN2 and EN4 of the North Norfolk Core Strategy which together require development proposals to be of a design to protect and enhance the special qualities of the area and to be suitable for the context within which they are set.

Other matters

9. I acknowledge that the proposal would be of benefit to the appellant in providing enhanced facilities to enjoy the rural location. I note too that the Council does not raise any concerns with regards to the amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring properties and there would be no direct overlooking of any properties from the windows or balcony of the proposed development. In addition, views of the rear elevation from public vantage points would be limited. However, the absence of harm in these respects does not outweigh the findings I have made in respect of the effect of the proposed development on the appearance of the area.
10. I acknowledge too that no objections to the proposal have been received. However, this in itself does not indicate a lack of harm arising from the proposal.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given, and having regard to all matters raised, I dismiss the appeal.

K Winnard

INSPECTOR