



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 21 September 2021

by William Cooper BA (Hons) MA CMLI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4th October 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/L2630/W/21/3270254

**Land adjacent to Field View, Welborne Common, Welborne, Norfolk
NR20 3LD**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr & Mrs S Beesley against the decision of South Norfolk District Council.
 - The application Ref: 2020/2074, dated 2 June 2020, was refused by notice dated 31 December 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as steel portal frame farm building to house straw and feed.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. Since the Council's decision, a new version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published in July 2021. The new Framework echoes and reinforces policy relevant to the main issue in this case. I shall determine the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is whether the proposal would have an overbearing effect on neighbouring occupants of the Solomon's Temple and Field View dwellings.

Reasons

4. The appeal site comprises a part stone surfaced, part grassed area and its access track. The site is used for storing farm apparatus and materials, including straw during drier weather. Also, the adjoining yard is used for parking farm vehicles and storing materials.
5. The site is located within a cluster of scattered, mainly two storey dwellings to the west of Welborn Common road, within a rural setting. This cluster includes Brick Kiln Farm and its large open-sided storage barn, which is used for storing straw. The existing barn is located close to the northern extent of the proposed additional barn. A tall evergreen, mainly conifer hedge is located between the existing and proposed barn's location and the Solomon's Temple dwelling, the grounds of which bound the hedge.
6. Solomon's Temple is a large detached house set in spacious grounds at the end of a verdant driveway. It has a more spacious and grand architectural character than some more modestly proportioned dwellings in the locality.

7. Compared to the Solomon's Temple dwelling, the more easterly location of the cluster of dwellings that includes Field View, together with the latter's position in the foreground of the proposed barn off Welborn Road, contribute to the impression of this cluster having a more established visual and spatial connection with the existing farm yard area and barn. Within this context, the proposed barn would assimilate with the existing barn, viewed from the environs of Field View and would not appear significantly overbearing and intrusive to occupants of this property. This is reflected in the no objection response of residents of this property to the proposal.
8. Also the boundary hedging and step down in ground level from Solomon's Temple's grounds to the appeal site help to provide some screening and provide a particular sense of visual containment within the appeal site.
9. Nevertheless, from what I saw during my visit to the site and its surroundings, part of the existing barn roof is strikingly visible from the grounds of the Solomon's Temple dwelling. In contrast to the green and verdant character of Solomon's Temple's grounds, the barn's red coloured roof material draws attention to its bulk and proximity to Solomon's Temple's residential boundary.
10. The proposed new barn would cumulatively further increase the substantial barn bulk north-east of Solomon's Temple, close to the latter's boundary. The upper part of the bulk of the proposed agricultural building would be noticeable above the top of the hedge from various points within the grounds of the Solomon's Temple dwelling. Furthermore, the presence of the lower part and intensified agricultural storage use of the proposed barn would be visibly perceptible from this neighbouring property through gaps in the boundary hedge, and audibly perceptible through activity and machinery/equipment movement. Also I have no certainty that in the future, boundary hedging between the barns and Solomon's Temple would endure sufficiently to screen the proposed cumulatively increased bulk of large agricultural buildings located so close to the residential boundary of Solomon's Temple.
11. The contrast of the proposed 'rusty red' fibre cement profiled sheet material of the barn's roof with the verdant greenery of Solomon's Temple's grounds would further draw attention to the agricultural character of the proposed building and its proximity to Solomon's Temple's residential boundary.
12. Given the above factors, the combination of the proposed barn's substantial size, agricultural character and close proximity to Solomon's Temple's boundary would result in an uncomfortable juxtaposition of agricultural and neighbouring residential buildings that would look and feel overbearing and intrusive to neighbouring occupants of the Solomon's Temple dwelling.
13. That the proposed barn is smaller and located further away from the Solomon's Temple dwelling boundary than a previously refused proposal¹ does not alter the above specifics in this case, and my consequent findings.
14. To conclude, the proposal would have an overbearing impact on the neighbouring occupants of the Solomon's Temple dwelling, and thus harm their amenity. As such, it would conflict with Policies DM 2.7 and DM 3.13 of the South Norfolk Local Plan Development Management Policies Document, which together seek, among other things, to ensure that development is sensitively

¹ Planning Application Ref: 2020/0941.

sited to protect the amenity of neighbours, including through avoiding overbearing impact.

Other Matters

15. The proposal would provide additional dry, year-round storage space for straw and feed, helping to enhance the operation of the cattle farming business. However, this would not outweigh the significant harm identified.

Conclusion

16. The proposed development would be contrary to the development plan and there are no other considerations which outweigh this finding. Accordingly, for the reasons given, the appeal fails.

William Cooper

INSPECTOR