



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 September 2023

by Ryan Cowley MPlan (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 September 2023.

Appeal Ref: APP/K2610/D/23/3317990

The Rutlands, 220 Fakenham Road, Taverham, Norwich, Norfolk NR8 6QN

- 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 Davies against the decision of Broadland District Council.
 - The application Ref 20221850, dated 18 November 2022, was refused by notice dated 24 January 2023.
 - The development proposed is described as garage to front of property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises a detached house and its associated curtilage, located on the north side of Fakenham Road. The surrounding area is primarily characterised by detached houses and bungalows. There is also a care home, petrol station and other commercial uses in the vicinity.
4. Dwellings on this side of Fakenham Road typically sit within generous, elongated plots, and are set back from the footpath behind large front garden areas. Though there are various types of walls and fencing to boundaries, these are often relatively low in height with tree and shrub planting behind and within front gardens, particularly in the vicinity of the appeal site. This arrangement positively contributes to the street scene, softening the built environment and giving the area a spacious and verdant character and appearance.
5. The front garden of the appeal property is relatively open, with a low fence running along the shared side boundary with 218 Fakenham Road. However, the opposite side boundary is more heavily screened by a tall hedgerow. A low wall runs along the frontage of the site, increasing in height to meet a tall pair of drive gates. There is also further tree and shrub planting along this frontage.
6. The proposal would be sited within the front garden of the appeal property, perpendicular to the main dwelling, with its blank gable elevation facing the street. It would be located some distance forward of the main dwelling, isolated between 2 large trees. Its proximity to the front boundary, combined with its overall size and light colour, would enhance its prominence in the street scene.
7. Existing boundary treatments and tree and shrub planting in the area would provide partial screening in certain views along Fakenham Road, particularly

when approaching from the north. However, some local planting is deciduous in nature and would be less effective in winter months. Moreover, due to the low boundary treatments and limited screening from other vantage points, the proposed garage would be prominent in other views, particularly from the south/east and across the junction with Roedich Drive.

8. In the above context, the proposal would appear as an incongruous and obtrusive addition to the street scene, introducing additional development into a predominantly open and green landscape, and detracting from the area's prevailing character and appearance.
9. I have had regard to other examples of garages located within front gardens in the vicinity of the appeal site. However, these are limited in number and somewhat sporadically located. Some are also different in size or position. The example next door to the appeal site at 222 Fakenham Road is single width and set further back into the plot. Similarly, examples at 226 and 226a Fakenham Road sit a significant distance from the front boundary. All three are closer, or attached, to their respective host dwellings.
10. Further to the north-west, I observed several other examples of attached or detached garages or car port structures, of varying size, level of screening and relationship to their host dwelling and the frontage. Ultimately however I do not find that any of the examples both presented to me in support of the appeal and observed on site contribute significantly to the prevailing character and appearance of the area, and in some cases are a detracting feature. Thus, this does not lead me to a different conclusion in respect of the main issue.
11. My attention has also been drawn to the nearby care home, which features a large hard surface carpark to the front, in addition to other hard surfaces and parked cars to the front of neighbouring dwellings. While such surfacing and vehicle parking has limited the amount of greenery in places, it does not detract from the area's prevailing open character and sense of space in the same way that the appeal proposal would.
12. I conclude that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area. It would be contrary to Policy GC4 of the Development Management DPD 2015 and TAV3 of the Taverham Neighbourhood Plan 2020-2040 July 2021. These policies, among other provisions, seek to ensure development is of a high standard of design, paying regard to the character and appearance of the area, and reinforcing local distinctiveness and development patterns.

Other Matters

13. While the Parish Council did not object to the application, this does not in itself demonstrate that the proposal is acceptable in respect of the main issue.

Conclusion

14. The proposal would conflict with the development plan, taken as a whole. There are no material considerations that indicate the appeal should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. Consequently, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Ryan Cowley

INSPECTOR