

## **APPEALS SUMMARY- SEPTEMBER**

### **3PL/2016/1361/F**

Model Farm, Chapel Street, Rockland St Peter, Rocklands NR17 1UJ (Proposal : Erection of three new dwellings and garages)

DISMISSED

The Inspector concluded that the development would cause unacceptable harm to living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties. On balance he considered that the adverse impact on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the combined benefits. An application for the award for costs was also dismissed.

### **3PL/2016/1038/O**

10 Cyprus Road, Attleborough, NR17 2EF (Proposal: Two ( 3 ) bed bungalows)

DISMISSED

The Inspector concluded that the proposed bungalows would greatly reduce the spaciousness to the rear of this section of Cyprus Road with a cramped and incongruous form of development that would be visible from the front and would harm the uniform layout of properties and gardens. He considered that this adverse impact carried significant weight and would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the development.

### **3PL/2017/0040/O**

115 Norwich Road, Watton, Thetford, Norfolk IP25 6DH (Proposal: Erection of 1 dwelling)

DISMISSED

The Inspector concluded that the development would have an unacceptably disturbing effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties. It would therefore, in this regard, also not accord with Policy DC1 which seeks to protect the amenity of existing occupants. In addition it would also contrast with the Framework which, in paragraph 17 requires development to secure a good standard of amenity for existing occupiers.

### **3PN/2016/0089/UC**

Park House, Park Common Lane, Kenninghall, NR 16 2ES (Prior approval to convert two barns into three dwellings under Class Q the GDPO 2015)

DISMISSED

The Inspector concluded that he could not be certain that the existing barns are structurally sufficient to be able to be converted without requiring works that fall beyond the criteria. He considered that the development would fail to accord with criteria ( a ) and ( i ) of paragraph Q.1 of the GPDO, and consequently the proposal would not constitute permitted development under Class Q of Part 3 to Schedule 2 of the GPDO.

**3PL/2017/153/F**

Wentworth Road, Attleborough, NR17 1BQ (Proposal: Erection of bungalow)

ALLOWED

The Inspector concluded that the development would provide acceptable living conditions for its future occupiers. The proposal would therefore accord with Policy DC1 of the Core Strategy which seeks to protect the amenity of future occupants. It was also reflect the Framework which, in paragraph 17, requires development to secure a good standard of amenity for future occupiers. He was also satisfied that there would be sufficient space for cars to turn and leave the site in a forward gear without entering the neighbouring land.

**3PL/2016/1190/0**

Mill Farm Fisheries, Church Street, Great Ellingham, Attleborough, NR17 1LE (Proposal: Residential Development)

DISMISSED

The Inspector concluded that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area and he couldn't be confident that the biodiversity of the site would be preserved. He gave these matters considerable weight and concluded that they would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the proposal. An application for cost was also dismissed. An application for costs was also dismissed.

**3PL/2016/0448/F**

Land adjacent to Oak Tree Pak, Norwich Road, Attleborough (Proposal: Change of use to residential for siting of up to 23 mobile homes)

DISMISSED

The Inspector concluded that the proposals would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. The development would conflict with Policies CP11 and Dc16 of Breckland Core Strategy and Development Control Policies 2009. These policies require high quality design which is responsive to local context and preserves or enhances the character of the area. He was also mindful of paragraph 64 of the National Planning Policy Framework which states that permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to improve the character and quality of an area.