

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 September 2024

by G Dring BA (Hons) MA MRTPI MAUDE

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 September 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/K2610/D/24/3345666

85 Park Road, Spixworth, Norwich, Norfolk NR10 3NP

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr & Mrs Tray against the decision of Broadland District Council.
 - The application Ref is 2024/0248.
 - The development proposed is a detached garage.
-

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 property is a single storey detached dwelling and associated garden area located in a residential area. Along Park Road, within the vicinity of the appeal site, dwellings are set back behind front gardens and driveways providing a consistent spaciousness which contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area.
- 4) The proposed garage would be a solid structure located in very close proximity to the front boundary of the appeal property. Outbuildings located in this forward position are not a common feature along this section of Park Road. The proposal would therefore result in a dominant addition to the streetscene which would be an incongruous feature in the locality. It would result in harm to the spacious character and appearance of the area.
- 5) The use of timber cladding and roof tiles to match the materials present in the construction of the host dwelling would not overcome this harm. Whilst a hedgerow planted along the boundaries would help to provide some screening, the proposed garage would still be visible at least partially across the driveway and when approaching the appeal site along Park Road from the east and west. There is also no guarantee that planting would remain in the longer term.

- 6) The appellant has referred me to a number of other properties within the wider village in support of their case, which I viewed during my site visit. I did not witness any detached outbuildings to the front of 35 Park Road. I note an interested party has suggested that the photos provided of this property relate to 32 Park Road. I found that the car port attached to an existing detached garage at No 32 appeared to be set further back from the front boundary than is proposed in the appeal scheme.
- 7) Whilst I acknowledge that there were some detached outbuildings located within the front garden areas of properties on Buxton Road and Crostwick Lane, they are located some distance away and are not visible from within the vicinity of the appeal site. In any event I must determine this appeal based on the merits of the scheme before me and the circumstances in respect of the appeal site and its surroundings.
- 8) The proposal would therefore be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. It would be contrary to Policy GC4 of the Broadland Development Management DPD 2015, Policy 2 of the Joint Core Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk, Adopted March 2011, amendments adopted January 2014 and Policy 7 of the Spixworth Neighbourhood Plan 2019 to 2039 Adopted Version July 2021. These policies seek, amongst other things, that developments respect local distinctiveness and preserve and enhance the village feel. The proposal would also be contrary to the aims of section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks to achieve well-designed and beautiful places.

Other Matters

- 9) I appreciate that the garage would be a private benefit to the appellants, providing secure vehicle storage on site. Nevertheless, this would not outweigh the harm to the character and appearance of the area.
- 10) I note that there were 2 letters of support from interested parties. I acknowledge that the setting of a hedgerow along the boundary would be in keeping with other properties along Park Road. However, whilst I note that there are boundary treatments around the front garden areas, this does not alter that the front gardens along this part of Park Road are generally free from more substantial structures such as outbuildings. These comments therefore do not alter my view set out above.

Conclusion

- 11) For the reasons given above, having had regard to the development plan as a whole, along with all other relevant material considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

G Dring

INSPECTOR