
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 October 2021

By Terrence Kemmann-Lane JP DipTP FRTPI MCMI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 02 November 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/L2630/W/21/3272676

Land Adjacent To 7 Harvey Close, Tasburgh, NR15 1LS

- 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 and Mrs Davis against the decision of South Norfolk District Council.
 - The application Ref. 2020/1621 dated 1 September 2020, was refused by notice dated 26 October 2020.
 - The development proposed is the erection of 2 bed single storey dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary matters

2. The 'Proposed Site/G FI Plan & Elevation' reference 2011.10 Rev. E shows the 'red line' boundary of the proposed dwelling extending around, and close to, the rear wall of the bungalow at No. 7 Harvey Close. It was unclear to me whether this was intended to show the garden area of the appeal proposal extending behind the existing dwelling. At the same time, I saw that the layout drawing on page 8 (un-numbered) of the appeal statement has a broken line running in a straight line from front to back. It is not clear what this is intended to convey. I therefore asked for clarification.
3. On behalf of the appellant it was explained that the red line on the planning application drawing 2011.10E denotes the site extent for the purposes of the application and was not necessarily intended to confirm the proposed ownership boundary. It includes potential for the contractor's possible working area at the rear of the no.7 dwelling. The dashed line on the un-numbered site plan on p8 of the appeal statement was intended to give a clearer indication of the applicants' intention regarding the ownership boundary. That plan is consistent with the block plan on p.4 of the statement. I approach my decision on the basis of this explanation.
4. The drawing reference 2011.10E mentioned above was submitted as part of the appeal and shows a lower roof line for the proposed bungalow than that shown on the plans submitted with the application to the council. The council appear to be satisfied that I can consider this revision since this drawing number is included in the condition No. 2 that is suggested in the event that the appeal is allowed. I cannot see that there would be prejudice to anyone by accepting it as the intention of the appeal. Therefore I base my decision on the revised drawing.

Main Issue

5. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed bungalow on the character of the area.

Reasons

6. Harvey Close is a short cul-d-sac of 9 bungalows, including the 2 each side of the junction with Low Road. These bungalows exhibit a degree of consistency, but also have significant design variation. It is clear that there have been alterations and extensions over the years since the original development in the 1960s. I consider that the design of the proposed bungalow would relate satisfactorily with the character of the design of the existing bungalows.
7. As to the matter of the spaces between buildings, the existing layout of the cul-de-sac does provide a good deal of space around the fronts of the bungalows, although this varies somewhat between the beginning of the close and its end. To begin with, Nos. 1 and 9 enjoy corner plots which provide wide frontages to Harvey Close. Nos. 2, 3, 7 and 8 have fairly wide frontages without any sense of being cramped. Nos. 4, 5 and 6 are grouped around the head of the Close, so that their actual frontages to the road are rather narrower. Nevertheless, they still have generally good open frontages, with only No. 5 having a more modest space at the front.
8. Overall I have concluded that this openness to the layout is important to the character of the area, and that this would be compromised by the appeal development that would sit very close to No. 7. This effect on the character would be exacerbated by the necessary amount of room in the shallow front gardens taken up with car parking space.
9. Whilst the proposal would provide a very modest addition to dwelling numbers, and the proposal has the advantage recognised in paragraph 69 (in the 2021 version – was 68 in the 2019 version) of the National Planning Policy Framework, that small and medium sized sites can make an important contribution to meeting the housing requirement of an area, I conclude that the propose bungalow would affect the character of the area by making a significant change to the amount of space about buildings which is typical of the Close. The applicant has provided information to indicate that the proposal is for a self-build dwelling. This carries some weight in favour of the application but given the harm that has been identified, this is not an overriding consideration. For these reasons, I will dismiss the appeal.

Terrence Kemmann-Lane

INSPECTOR