



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 November 2021

by Philip Mileham BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: Tuesday 07 December 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/U2615/W/21/3270189

Land west of 'Strawlands' Mill Road, Burgh Castle, Great Yarmouth NR31 9QW.

- 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 G MILLER against the decision of Great Yarmouth Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 06/19/0409/F, dated 12 July 2019, was refused by notice dated 10 November 2020.
 - The development proposed is a residential bungalow with garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development taken from the application form does not accurately describe the development applied for. As such, I have taken the description from the Council's decision notice which more accurately reflects what has been applied for to which there is no dispute between the parties.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are:
 - Whether the site is in a suitable location for a new dwelling; and
 - The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

Suitable location

4. The appeal site is a flat area of paddock land located to the rear of 'Strawlands' which is a detached single-storey dwelling with accompanying stables and outbuildings located on Mill Road.
5. Saved policy HOU10 of the Great Yarmouth Borough-Wide Local Plan (2001) (GYLP) sets out criteria for development in the countryside outside development boundaries allowing for agriculture, forestry, organised recreation or the expansion of existing institutions. There is no dispute between the parties that the proposed residential development would be outside of Burgh Castle's defined village development limits boundary. As such, it would be contrary to the provisions of policy HOU10. The saved policy pre-dates the

publication of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), and as a result, does not fully reflect the NPPF's approach to rural housing which does not place the same limitations. In light of this, policy HOU10 is afforded moderate weight.

6. Policy CS1(e) of the adopted Great Yarmouth Core Strategy (2015) (GYCS) seeks to support new development that provides easy access to jobs, shops and community facilities by walking, cycling and public transport. Policy CS2 of the GYCS seeks to balance the delivery of new homes with jobs and service provision. There is no evidence before me to indicate that Burgh Castle has any existing shops, services or facilities that would support day-to-day living or any evidence of employment opportunities in the village. There is no footpath or streetlighting in this part of Mill Road, which would make it less attractive for journeys to be made by foot or cycle.
7. Therefore, journeys to access employment, services and facilities would likely be made by private vehicular transport to larger settlements such as Great Yarmouth. Cumulatively, over time, these would add up to a significant number of trips which would be at odds with policies CS1 and CS2 which seek to set out a strategy to provide access to jobs and services by modes of transport other than private vehicles and reduce the need to travel.
8. In light of the above, I consider the proposed development would not be in a suitable location for a new dwelling. As such, it would fail to accord with policy HOU10 of the GYLP and policies CS1(e) and CS2 of the GYCS for the reasons set out above.

Character and appearance

9. The area of Mill Road in the vicinity of the appeal site is characterised by a linear development of predominantly single storey dwellings along the road frontage. The linear development creates a regular rhythm to the dwellings and makes a positive contribution to the character of this part of the area.
10. The appeal site itself is a flat area of paddock land located to the rear of Strawlands and would be located behind an existing menage. There would be a considerable distance between the proposed dwelling and the rear of Strawlands that would result in the proposal disrupting the linear rhythm of residential development in this part of Mill Road. Although there are stables and outbuildings to the rear of Strawlands, from my observations on site, there are no other rearward dwellings apparent in the area. As such, the proposal would adversely affect the grain of development in the area and result in the extension of residential development into the countryside.
11. In light of the above, I consider that the proposed development would result in harm to the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore fail to accord with policies HOU7 and HOU17 of the GYLP which state that proposals should not be significantly detrimental to the form, character and setting of the settlement and the sub-division of plots will be resisted where it would be likely to lead to development out of character and scale with the surroundings.

Other matters

12. The appellant has drawn my attention to other proposals granted in the village albeit no precise details have been submitted into the appeal. As such, the

circumstances in those cases may be different from those before me, and as such, have not altered my conclusions in respect of the main issues.

13. The proposal would provide a benefit through the provision of an additional dwelling of a type which may be in short supply in the area. The proposal would provide economic benefits through its construction and in the accompanying supply of materials. There would also be some social benefit as a result of the contribution of future occupiers to nearby community facilities.
14. Concern has been raised by a third party in respect of the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of nearby occupiers. However, as I am dismissing the appeal for other reasons, it is not necessary for me to consider this matter in further detail.

Conclusion

15. Whilst the proposal would provide some benefits as set out above, as the proposal is for a single dwelling, I consider these would be limited and not sufficient to outweigh the harm identified or conflict with the development plan when read as a whole.
16. Therefore, for the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal is dismissed.

Philip Mileham

INSPECTOR

