



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 January 2022

by A.Graham BA(hons) MAued IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24TH February 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/K2610/W/21/3275541

Plot of Land Between Beech Hill and Burgate Hill House, Newton Road, Hainford NR10 3LT

- 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 John Hipperson against the decision of Broadland District Council.
 - The application Ref 20201809, dated 28 September 2020, was refused by notice dated 5 February 2021.
 - The proposed development is for detached dwelling (outline).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are concerned with the principle of locating a new dwelling to this site and the impact of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a modest parcel of land located between two larger properties. The site is located on a slight rise up from Newton Road that itself runs along this small valley edge and skirts the open fields of the valley below. Beyond the rear boundary of the appeal site open arable land occupies something of a plateau that is separated by a sparse boundary of shrubs, brambles and trees. To the front of the property an area of verge and more hedge planting contribute to the rural feel of this part of Newton Road.
4. The two flanking properties are both relatively large in scale, especially 'Beech Hill' that stands set back from the road edge within mixed woodland and coniferous tree in its grounds. The other property appears to be much older with an attractive Mock Tudor gable feature fronting onto Newton Road making it visible on approach from the village of Hainford as Newton Road curves uphill.
5. These two properties are some distance from the nearest village and although I saw a bus service whilst on my site visit I would consider these properties to appear sufficiently isolated so as to not be specifically related to any nearby settlement.

6. The proposal before me seeks permission for a single house of around 162 square metres which would be set well back into this plot with hardstanding to the frontage for the parking of vehicles. Although the application is in outline with all matters reserved except access, an indicative plan of a pitched roof detached home has been suggested.
7. It appears common ground between the parties that this site is located without the settlement limit boundaries of Hainforth and that it is an unallocated site within the Local Plan. Policy GC2 of the Development Management DPD (2015) reflects the National Planning Policy Framework (The Framework) in its aspiration for new dwellings to be located within existing settlements so as to secure sustainable future development and avoid piecemeal sprawl into the countryside.
8. The Council can also demonstrate in excess of a five year housing land supply and as such unless a proposal can meet a specific need identified within the Development Management DPD or Joint Core Strategy (JCS), (such as meeting a need for rural workers or being affordable housing), development within the countryside would be resisted.
9. I have no evidence before me that the appellant can meet any of the specific needs as outlined in the development plan and as such I conclude that the appeal would fail to meet the specific requirements for rural housing as outlined in the Development Management DPD or the Joint Core Strategy 2014 (JCS).
10. Although the application was in outline only, with all matters reserved, the appellant has submitted indicative designs that could be used to illustrate the potential design of a new dwelling here. Although I give these designs little weight due to their indicative nature, I consider that the proposed form and architectural style would be at odds with the overriding distinctive character of the area and would not be of such exemplary architectural design that could meet Policy 2 of the JCS or Policies GC4 and EN2 of the Development Management DPD 2015.
11. Moreover, the proposed driveway and frontage parking would further open up the boundary hedge line and likely replace this with hardstanding and vehicles, which I consider would be visible and would contribute to a further urbanisation of this site which would be to the detriment of the rural character. In light of this I consider that some further erosion of the attractive rural character and appearance of Newton Road would occur that would further fail to meet Policies identified above.

Other Matters

12. The appellant has directed my attention to other examples of housing development in the local area and I saw on my site visit that there are some other larger housing developments being constructed locally. I have however no information before me as to the precise reasons or background to these developments or whether they were unallocated sites within the Local Plan. As such I cannot be certain that the circumstances are the same as the case before me and as such I can give these other only very limited weight.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons above, taking into account all other matters raised, I dismiss the appeal.

A Graham

INSPECTOR