



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 July 2025

by **R Norman BA(Hons), MA, MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1st August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Y2620/W/25/3364842

Lilac Cottage, Knapton Road, North Walsham, Norfolk NR28 0RP

- 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 Mark Short against the decision of North Norfolk District Council.
 - The application Ref is PF/24/2625.
 - The development proposed is Change of use of outbuilding to B&B/holiday let.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The use of the outbuilding as a B&B/holiday let has already commenced and I have considered the appeal on this basis.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are:
 - Whether there would be sufficient parking provision and suitable vehicular access in relation to highway safety; and
 - Whether there is suitable evidence or mitigation to demonstrate that there would not be significant detrimental effects on the integrity of European Sites in relation to nutrient enrichment.

Reasons

Access and Parking

4. The appeal site is located on Knapton Road and comprises a semi-detached property and associated outbuilding, driveway and garden. The holiday let is located in the rear garden of the existing property and provides a modest 1-bed property. There is an existing gravel driveway to the front of the appeal site.
5. The existing property is a two-bedroomed dwelling and the Council's parking standards¹ usually require 2 spaces for a property of this size. The Appellant has stated that they have one car currently.
6. The holiday let is likely to generate one additional car visiting the property and the local highway authority considers that this would generate 3 - 4 additional vehicle movements to and from the property per day. The parking for the holiday let is on

¹ Appendix C: Parking Standards, North Norfolk Core Strategy

the existing driveway, in front of the existing timber-clad outbuilding, with the parking for the occupiers of the dwelling being located in front of the existing house. There is an area for turning in the middle of the parking area which would allow vehicles to turn and exit the driveway in forward gear. I note a number of letters of support have been received from people who have stayed in the holiday accommodation confirming that they have had no issues with the parking arrangements at the property.

7. The Appellant has provided a plan showing the dimensions of the existing driveway and that it would be possible to park two cars in front of the dwelling with a total width of 5m. However, the parking guidelines specify that where spaces are located adjacent to a wall or fence, they should be widened to 3m per space. Accordingly, this area falls slightly under the guidance width.
8. I have had regard to the evidence and the traffic speed data provided however, I consider that one additional car using the holiday accommodation would not amount to a harmful level of intensification and also note that the holiday let is not occupied all year round. Therefore, whilst there would be a slight shortfall in the required parking levels, this would not result in severe harm considering the limited size of the holiday let.
9. In terms of visibility, I note that this is somewhat restricted given the bend in the road and the boundary treatments, including the hedge. I note however that there has been a reduction in the Speed limit along Knapton Road to 40mph. The required visibility for a 40mph road would be 2.4m x 120m and the existing access falls short of this by some way. However, there is a mirror located opposite the driveway which assists with access, and the ability to turn a car within the driveway means that vehicles would be leaving the appeal site in forward gear. I have also taken into the consideration the low levels of increased vehicle movement over the existing access use and the seasonal use of the property. I therefore find that whilst the visibility splays are not in accordance with the required standards, for the above reasons this would not result in severe harm in terms of highway safety.
10. The development is therefore broadly in accordance with policies CT 5 and CT 6 of the North Norfolk Core Strategy (2008) (Core Strategy) and Paragraph 116 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) insofar as they require development to be served by safe access and provide adequate vehicle parking facilities, amongst other things. I have found that the arrangement would not wholly comply with the parking standards and required visibility splays but, for the above reasons, do not find this to be unduly harmful.

Nutrient Enrichment

11. The appeal site is located within the catchment area for The River Bure – Ant Broads Nutrient Neutrality Surface Water Catchment Area and the development would result in the creation of additional overnight accommodation. It falls within the area subject to Nutrient Neutrality guidance which requires competent authorities to ensure that such developments provide evidence that there will be no net increase in nutrient loads within an affected catchment area.
12. The holiday let is served by a septic tank, which outflows into the surface water catchment area and as such has the potential to have an adverse impact in terms of nutrient pollution. The Appellant has identified that they are due to have a new water treatment centre installed in the next few months to address this issue.

13. Whilst I note that a new water treatment centre is due to be installed shortly, I have limited details of this including evidence of its forthcoming installation or whether this would be sufficient to ensure that it would mitigate any potential harm in terms of nutrient neutrality. Furthermore, full details of the phosphorus and nitrate levels or a nutrient calculator have not been submitted. Without these details, I am unable to conclude that the development would be acceptable in this regard.
14. The development therefore fails to comply with the requirements of Policies SS 4 and EN 9 of the Core Strategy which seek to ensure that development ensures protection and enhancement of natural assets and geodiversity, takes opportunities to improve river water quality and minimise air, land and water pollution where possible, and provide prevention, mitigation and compensation measures, amongst other things.

Other Matters

15. The Council raise concerns that the building may be unauthorised and exceed permitted development parameters, however I have been given no specific details of the likely date of construction and therefore I am unable to conclude on this matter.

Conclusion

16. For the reasons given above, and having had regard to all matters raised, the appeal should be dismissed.

R Norman

INSPECTOR