



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 November 2024

by A Hartley LLB (Hons) Solicitor MBA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 02 January 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/L2630/D/24/3345436

Hilltop, The Street, Trowse, Norwich NR14 8SP

- 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 Jon Robinson against the decision of South Norfolk District Council.
 - The application Ref is 2024/0153.
 - The development proposed is for the erection of a cartlodge.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The proposal is within the setting of a listed building. Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act) applies. Accordingly, I have had special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of architectural or historic interest which it possesses.
3. The proposal is also within the Trowse and Newton Conservation Area (TNCA). Section 72 of the Act applies. Accordingly, I have had special regard to preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area.
4. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) has been updated since the appeal representations were made. However, as the revisions do not affect the matters under consideration in this appeal, (other than paragraph references) it was not considered necessary to seek further comment.

Main Issues

5. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on (i) the setting of the Grade II listed building (Trowse Old Hall¹) and (ii) the character or appearance of the TNCA.

¹ 1373213

Reasons

Designated Heritage Asset – Setting of Listed Building

6. Trowse Old Hall lies in a prominent position. Within its setting, the more modern dwellings opposite (including the appeal property) are set well back from the road frontage to maintain the sense of spaciousness. Although there is a garage forward of one of the modern dwellings approximately 40 metres from the appeal property (granted planning permission in the 1980's²), this has a negative effect on the openness of the setting. The open frontage to the appeal property contributes positively to the remaining sense of space within the setting of Trowse Old Hall. This preserves the prominence of this designated heritage asset (DHA) in the street scene.
7. The appeal property is a substantial modern two storey house of red brick with pantile roof, set back from the highway in an elevated position with an open frontage. It lies directly opposite Trowse Old Hall. This DHA dates from 1771, refaced in Gothic style circa 1760 in colourwashed flint and brick with pantiled roofs. Crenellated parapets all round conceal hipped roofs. There are two large brick stacks that emerge over the parapets. It is set immediately at the back of the pavement. In so far as is relevant to this appeal proposal, the significance and special interest of Trowse Old Hall lie, in part, in the structure itself, its surviving fabric, form and historical development, but its prominent position is also an important aspect of its significance.
8. The appeal proposal would introduce a single storey garage building of horizontal cement boarding sitting on a brick plinth, under a red clay pantile pitched roof, at the front of the host dwelling. It would be in an elevated, prominent, forward position in the street scene. It would be seen as part of the setting and would be a permanent and incongruous addition a very short distance from the front of the listed building. Despite existing and proposed planting, it would be an obtrusive feature in the street scene. Even with careful design and materials, the extent of built development to the front of the host dwelling would cause harm by disrupting the openness that is an important characteristic of this part of the setting of Trowse Old Hall, presently contributing to its significance by preserving its prominence.
9. Consequently, the setting of the listed building would not be preserved and the proposal fails to comply with policy 1 of the Joint Core Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk (2014) (the JCS) and policies DM 3.8 and DM 4.10 of the South Norfolk Local Plan 2015 (the LP) in so far as relevant.
10. I find that the identified harm to the historic and architectural significance of the DHA caused by the negative effect of the appeal proposal on the prominence of the DHA through development within its setting, would by virtue of its nature and extent amount to a level of harm that in terms of the Framework would be less than substantial, but nevertheless of considerable importance and weight.

Designated Heritage Asset - Conservation Area

11. The Trowse Newton Conservation Area Appraisal (TNCAA) highlights that its special interest in having a 'model village' character is attributed to development by Colman in the late nineteenth century. It comprises, inter alia, housing, public

² The Bungalow

buildings, allotments, chapel and reading room. However, the part of the TNCA in which the appeal proposal is situated has a more varied character. One of the significant features of this part of the TNCA is Trowse Old Hall. The identified harm that would be caused by the appeal proposal to the significance of Trowse Old Hall would inevitably cause some residual harm to the special interest of the TNCA as a whole, the character and appearance of which would not be preserved.

12. Therefore, the proposal fails to comply with policy 1 of the JCS and policies DM 3.8 and DM 4.10 of the LP in so far as relevant.
13. I find that the identified harm to the character and appearance of the TNCA as a DHA would by virtue of its nature and extent amount to a level of harm that in terms of the Framework would be less than substantial, but nevertheless of considerable importance and weight.

Heritage Balance

14. As I find that the level of harm to each of the DHAs would be less than substantial in terms of the Framework, in accordance with paragraph 215 of the Framework, I must weigh the identified harm against any public benefits of the proposal.
15. From the evidence before me, the provision of additional storage that would result from the proposal does not amount to a public benefit. I find that there is no public benefit that justifies the harm. I therefore conclude that the appeal proposal would cause unjustified harm to the DHAs.

Conclusion

16. For the above reasons, having regard to all representations made, I conclude that the proposal conflicts with the development plan as a whole and with the provisions of the Framework in relation to heritage assets. There are no material considerations that would justify a decision other than one in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, the appeal should be dismissed.

A Hartley

INSPECTOR