



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 March 2025

**by Lewis Condé BSc, MSc, MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

**Decision date: 1 May 2025**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/E9505/W/24/3353862**

**Hill Crest, Shipmeadow, Beccles, Suffolk NR34 8HJ**

- 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 Peter Albon against the decision of Broads Authority.
  - The application Ref is BA/2024/0092/FUL.
  - The development proposed is storage barn.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Preliminary Matters

2. At the time of my site visit it was apparent that the proposed development had been undertaken.
3. I am also the Inspector dealing with another appeal<sup>1</sup> at this property. Given the context of the appeal sites and similarities in the reasons for refusal and policy contexts for each of these appeals, there is some degree of repetition between my decisions. However, each case has been determined on its own merits.
4. A revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published in December 2024. In respect of matters of pertinence to the appeal scheme, there have been no fundamental changes to national policy. Accordingly, comments on the updated Framework were not requested from the main parties.

### Main Issues

5. The main issues are the effect of the appeal scheme on: i) the character and appearance of the area, and the natural beauty of the Broads and ii) the living conditions of neighbouring residents with respect to overbearing impacts and loss of outlook.

### Reasons

6. The appeal site lies within the Broads Authority Executive Area (the Broads). The Broads is a Protected Landscape that has the same status as a National Park. The Levelling-Up and Regenerations Act 2023 amends the duty on relevant authorities in respect of their functions to now “seek to further” the statutory purposes of Protected Landscapes.

---

<sup>1</sup> Appeal Reference: APP/E9505/D/24/3349349

7. Amongst other matters, the statutory purpose of the Broads is to conserve and enhance the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of the Broads. These duties are reflected in the Framework, with paragraph 189 confirming that great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in the Broads which has the highest status of protection in relation to these issues.
8. The appeal site is within a small rural settlement and mainly lies to the rear of residential properties that front onto the B1062. The site is a sizeable plot, that backs onto open countryside and can be seen from a range of nearby locations.
9. The built form nearby varies in scale and appearance but predominantly comprises dwellings, which maintain a broadly rural character despite not displaying a strong sense of cohesion. Meanwhile, the surrounding area is largely defined by a rather expansive, tranquil, pastoral landscape that is reflective of its location within the Broads.
10. Together the scale of the storage barn, its external treatments and use of large steel roller shutter doors result in the proposed building having a modern industrial appearance that does not sit comfortably or reflect its rural landscape setting. The siting of shipping containers alongside the main barn also results in an element of clutter and further adds to this industrial character of development.
11. Although set back within the site, behind residential built form, the storage barn remains clearly visible from public vantage points. In any case, a lack of prominence is not an appropriate reason to allow uncharacteristic development. Meanwhile, cladding of the proposed storage containers alongside the main barn would not suitably mitigate the above identified harm.
12. The appellant has referred to other barns of varying designs in the surrounding area, but no specific details have been provided. Meanwhile, planning permission has previously been granted for a storage barn at the site (LPA ref: BA/2021/0468/FUL). The design of the appeal scheme, however, is materially different to the previously approved development, while for reasons outlined above the current proposal remains inappropriate.
13. Overall, the appeal scheme causes harm to the character and appearance of the area and so does not conserve the natural beauty of the Broads. It therefore conflicts with Policies SP7, DM16, and DM43 of the Local Plan for the Broads (adopted 2019) (the Local Plan). Together, amongst other matters, these seek to ensure that development is of a high-quality, that integrates effectively with its surroundings and reinforces local distinctiveness and landscape character. The appeal scheme also conflicts with the aims of Paragraph 189 of the Framework.
14. The Local Planning Authority has also referred to Local Plan Policy DM21 (Amenity) in its first reason for refusal, but I have not found it to be direct relevant to this main issue.

#### *Living Conditions of Neighbouring Residents*

15. The storage containers are sizeable and located tight to the boundary with adjacent residential properties. Although rather unsightly, in the context of this domestic environment, the storage containers remain a considerable distance from the neighbouring dwellinghouses. Additionally, the neighbouring properties are

served by generous rear gardens. As such, I do not consider the storage containers result in any harmful overbearing impacts.

16. The appellant has also indicated a willingness to clad the storage containers, which could be suitably secured by way of condition on the grant of a permission. Subject to such a condition, this would appropriately mitigate the unsightly nature of the storage containers when viewed from the neighbouring properties. Albeit this does not overcome my above concerns regarding the effect of the appeal scheme on the character and appearance of the area.
17. Consequently, in respect of this main issue, I do not consider that the appeal scheme would result in harm to the living conditions of neighbouring residents in respect of overbearing impacts or loss of outlook. I therefore find the appeal scheme to comply with Local Plan Policy DM21, which requires development not to have an unacceptable impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties or uses.

### **Other Matters**

18. The design of the development may offer the appellant maintenance and security benefits. Additionally, the appellant indicates that changes to the previously approved design were undertaken during the development's construction phase, without the realising the works would require planning permission. Nevertheless, these matters do not justify approval of the appeal scheme.

### **Conclusion**

19. For the reasons outlined above, the appeal scheme conflicts with the development plan as a whole and there are no material considerations, including the provisions of the Framework, that indicate a decision should be taken other than in accordance with it. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

*Lewis Condé*

INSPECTOR