

Appeals Summary – May 2017

Appeal Reference: APP/F2605/D/16/3167427

Appeal by: Mr John Simmons.

Moatside, Pages Lane, Saham Toney - remove an existing 2m hedge to the front boundary and replace with a brick wall with decorative railings 1.7metres high.

Planning Reference: 3PL/2016/1062/HOU

Dismissed

The inspector felt that the development would alter the character and appearance of the area and was therefore contrary to adopted policies as set out in the Development Plan.

Appeal Reference: APP/F2605/W/17/316717

Appeal by: Mr Chris Palmer

Land to the south of The Street, Gooderstone - Erection of two, two storey dwellings

Planning Reference: 3PL/2016/1127/O

Dismissed

The Inspector stated that the appeal site is physically detached from the core of Gooderstone, existing services are limited in nature and scope and did not consider that occupants would readily walk or cycle between the appeal site and nearby settlements. The development would be isolated from key facilities required for day to day living and not accord with paragraphs 17 or 55 of the Framework. The Inspector did not consider that the provision of full-time accommodation for the appellant as a rural worker was justified. He also stated that the proposed development would intensify and consolidate the built form in this location, having an urbanising effect, materially harmful to the rural character of the area.

Appeal Reference: APP/F2605/W/16/3162211

Appeal by: Mr Matthew Gibbard, Tingdene Parks Ltd.

Land adjacent to Oak Tree Park, Norwich Road, Attleborough - Demolition of a light industrial unit and the erection of a bungalow

Planning Reference: 3PL/2016/0448/F

Dismissed

The Inspector concluded that the proposals for 23 detached mobile homes, associated gardens and parking would create a highly regimented layout, with significantly more visual prominence in the street scene which would be out of character with existing development along Norwich Road. The Inspector concluded the proposed scheme would be significantly different from the one previously approved and would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area.

Appeal Reference: APP/F2605/W/16/3165265

Appeal By: Mr S Willmott.

Land south of Magdalen House, Redgrave Road, South Lopham – Three residential units.

Planning Reference: 3PL/2016/0897/O

Dismissed

The Inspector considered that forward visibility for northbound traffic would have an adverse effect on highway safety and there would be significant risks to pedestrian safety. In the absence of a heritage assessment the development would cause harm to an archaeological asset. However, he concluded that conditions could be imposed to safeguard the future health and longevity of the trees within the site; that the development would not detract from the prevailing character and appearance of the Conservation Area; and there would not be particular harm arising from the limited number of private car journeys generated by the development.

Costs application

The application for an award of costs was refused due to there being sufficient grounds for refusing planning permission in respect of harm to the character and appearance of the area and that the Council have been consistent in their approach to determining these types of applications. Therefore, unreasonable behaviour resulting in unnecessary expense during the appeal process was not demonstrated by the appellant.

Appeal Reference: APP/F2605/W/15/3081105

Appeal by: Mr Joseph Jay

Otterwood Kennels, Dereham Road, Shipdham - the use of land for the stationing of caravans for residential purposes for 1 no gypsy pitch together with the formation of additional hard standing and utility dayrooms ancillary to that use.

Planning Reference: 3PL/2014/0892/F

Allowed and temporary planning permission is granted for two years, subject to conditions.

The Inspector identified that the site may have highways impacts and is not located within a reasonable distance to local facilities and services therefore having the potential to encourage unsustainable patterns of travel. However, this was outweighed by the need for gypsy and traveller sites, no five year supply of gypsy and traveller sites and currently no available and suitable alternative sites.

Costs application

The application for an award of costs was refused as the Council correctly examined the proposal against relevant local and national policy having regard to sustainability, highway safety and other matters and found harm because of the site's location and

proposed use of an existing access. The Inspector further agreed that the Council did not deliberately prevent or delay development or act unreasonably.