



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 9 November 2021

by Philip Mileham BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30TH November 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/Y2620/W/21/3273830

61 Runtun Road, Cromer, NR27 9AU

- 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 Nick Kohler against the decision of North Norfolk District Council.
 - The application Ref PF/20/2073, dated 22 October 2020, was refused by notice dated 19 January 2021.
 - The development proposed is the conversion of an existing workshop/studio building into a self-contained one bedroom dwelling with PV solar panels, private garden, vehicle parking, bicycle and refuse storage provision.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is single storey workshop building located to the rear of No. 61 Runtun Road. The appeal site is a corner plot, and the siting of the proposed development would relate more closely to the properties in Westcliff Avenue which runs perpendicular to Runtun Road. The properties in Westcliff Avenue are a mix of detached and semi-detached two storey properties with a range of external finishes including brick with either render or timber cladding, as well as some with light painted brickwork.
4. The properties in the area have a mix of roof styles with pitched and hipped types evident in the street scene. The appeal proposal includes a flat-roofed tower to the western elevation which faces on to Westcliff Avenue. Due to the limited extent of the proposed front curtilage, the tower element would appear highly prominent, dominating the elevation. The surrounding area does not contain any examples of residential properties with flat-roof tower features, and although the appellant has drawn my attention to a number of examples of tower-like structures or similar design features elsewhere in Cromer, there did not appear to be any in the vicinity of the proposed development.
5. Whilst I note that the appellant has sought to design the proposed dwelling to deliberately introduce a clear addition to the roof structure, the tower's flat-roofed appearance would jar with the pitched and hipped roofs of the nearby properties which make a positive contribution to the character of the area. As

such, the tower element would be a highly prominent and incongruous feature in the street scene detracting from the overall character of the area.

6. The appeal development would have a smaller and less spacious plot than the surrounding dwellings which are predominantly larger with extensive elongated gardens. The proposed dwelling itself would occupy the majority of the site area and the development would be sited directly along its rear boundary. The proposed dwelling would also be in very close proximity to both of the side boundaries of the site with very limited separation space. The result of this is that the proposal would have very limited outdoor space and would appear cramped on the plot. As such, it would be significantly at odds with the prevailing character of the area which is for dwellings with more spacious plots.
7. The appellant has drawn my attention to the North Norfolk Design Guide (2008) (NNDG) and indicated that does not specify any particular local detail. No references have been provided into the appeal of the parts of the NNDG that the development would accord with albeit the appellant considers the proposal would meet the space requirements of the NNDG. Whilst the proposal would provide refuse and recycling storage facilities and on-site cycle storage as per the NNDG these would be required of all development, and as such are a neutral factor. I consider that the cramped site layout would therefore fail to preserve or enhance the character of quality of the area that Policy EN4 of the adopted North Norfolk Core Strategy (2008) (NNCS) requires.
8. In light of the above, I conclude that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area. As such, it would fail to accord with Policy EN4 of the adopted NNCS which states, amongst other things, that design which fails to have regard to local context and does not preserve or enhance the character and quality of an area will not be acceptable.
9. The proposal would also fail to accord with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) paragraph 134 which states that development that is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies.

Other Matters

10. The appeal proposal would provide economic benefit through construction and in the supply of materials as well as making a contribution to meeting local housing need in the area. The appellant has indicated that the proposal would include sustainable heating and include energy generation from photovoltaics which would provide an environmental benefit. However, as the proposal is for a single dwelling, these benefits would be limited.

Conclusion and planning balance

11. Whilst the proposed development would provide a number of benefits as set out above, these would not be sufficient to outweigh the harm I have identified or the conflict with the development plan when taken as a whole.
12. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Philip Mileham

INSPECTOR