

## **Appeals Summary – March**

### **3PL/2016/1398/HOU**

12 Larch Close, Attleborough - A single storey front extension

Allowed

The inspector felt that the proposal would not be unduly overbearing or overshadow the neighbouring property due to the orientation of the properties. The appeal was allowed on the basis that there would be no unacceptable effects on the amenity of neighbouring properties.

### **3PL/2016/0862/O**

Beechwood House, Wretham Road, Great Hockham - Erection of a new dwelling and carport

Allowed

The Inspector stated that the site is reasonably accessible to services and facilities by sustainable means. The proposal would not be isolated in terms of its proximity to the village facilities and it would enable the use of sustainable means of transport. The Inspector raised doubts as to the robustness of the Council's claimed five year housing land supply and on this basis put little weight on adopted policies. The Inspector concluded that the proposed dwelling would contribute to housing supply albeit to a limited extent, the travel options available to the occupants would be neither negative nor positive in the planning balance and the proposal would accord with the economic dimension of sustainable development through the construction of the dwelling and the likelihood of support for local business arising from construction.

### **3PL/2015/1283/O**

2 Wooden Bungalow, West Tofts - Demolition of a light industrial unit and the erection of a bungalow

Dismissed

The Inspector stated that the site is not within any settlement boundary and does not accord with policy. However, raised doubts as to the robustness of the Council's claimed five year housing land supply and on this basis put little weight on adopted policy. The Inspector felt the proposal would not accord with key provisions of the NPPF including making the fullest use of walking, cycling and public transport and the avoidance of new homes in the countryside that are isolated from services and facilities. The site was considered to have some environmental value, weighing against any benefit arising from its redevelopment and visual improvement.

### **3OB/2016/0003/OB**

Land at the Former Radar Site, Norwich Road - Modification of a planning obligation to reduce the affordable housing from 30% to 22.7% and to change the housing mix from social rented and shared ownership to affordable rented and shared equity dwellings.

Allowed

The Inspector considered the introduction of the specified amounts of shared equity housing would be acceptable on this site. The difference between the Council and the Appellants cases for the Benchmark Land Value (BLV) and the sales/marketing costs was noted. With regards to the BLV, the Inspector agreed with the Council's case that the Appellant had not submitted '*clear ... and appropriate evidence*' to demonstrate that the scheme was unviable. With regards to the sales/marketing he agreed with the higher figure as set out by the Appellant. Although, clear and appropriate evidence to demonstrate that 22.7% (35) of the dwellings need be affordable was not submitted, the Inspector concluded the original obligation should be modified to require 27.9% (43) of the units to be affordable, and this would comprise 28 for rent and 15 for shared equity.

### **3PL/2016/0755/F**

34 Swaffham Road - New three bedroom bungalow with detached garage and modified access to the highway

Dismissed

The Inspector concluded that the proposed development would not be acceptable in terms of flood risk because it would locate a dwelling within a high risk flood risk area, where the required Sequential Test indicates that there are other safer locations available for residential use.

### **3PL/2016/1059/O**

Land adjoining Cowslip Lodge Dury Lane - Erection of two dwellings

Dismissed

The Inspector stated that this part of Drury Lane is characterised by sporadic housing development within open countryside, separated by large gaps and the addition of two dwellings into a space that currently contributes to the rural street scene would appear intrusive, which planting and screening would not change. The effect would be the creation of a form of development harmful to the open rural character and the appearance of this area.