

## **APPEALS SUMMARY- DECEMBER**

**3PL//2017/1377/F- Land opposite Highcroft, Sandy Lane, East Tuddenham, NR20 3JH**  
( Temporary kennel maid accommodation in a purpose built lodge)

DISMISSED

The Inspector concluded that the proposal would result in an isolated new home in the countryside and that it has not been demonstrated that there is an essential need for a rural worker to live permanently at or near their place of work. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies SS1 and CP14 of the DPD and to paragraph 79 of the Framework. These policies seek, amongst other things, to restrict and control development, including dwellings, in the countryside in order to support the Council's settlement strategy and to avoid isolated dwellings unless there is an essential need to accommodate a rural worker. The Inspector also concluded that the appeal site is not a suitable location for a dwelling having regard to its accessibility and proximity to services and facilities. Future occupiers of the dwelling would be likely to be heavily reliant on the use of a car. This would be contrary to Policy DC16 which requires amongst other things, interdependent places to be well connected along routes that promote a choice of transport mode which seek to promote sustainable transport. The appeal was accordingly dismissed.

**3PL/2017/1080/O – Adjacent/ rear of Pinewood House, off Gorgate Drive, Fakenham Road, Hoe Dereham NR20 4HA** ( Residential development of 2 bungalows)

DISMISSED

The Inspector concluded that the two bungalows proposed would be contrary to local and national planning policies over the location of new development where this would lead to further private car use in conflict with general objectives to reduce congestion and emissions, and improve air quality and public health. The Inspector also concluded that the bungalows would detract from the appearance of the quite pleasant, open country side within which they would be located, not in any way reflecting its rural character for these reasons the development would conflict with Policy CP11, DC1 and DC16 which collectively aim to protect the character and appearance of the countryside from development of an inappropriate nature and design. The appeal was accordingly dismissed by the Inspector.

**3PL/2017/1081/O- . Adjacent Topfields, Fakenham Road, Hoe, Dereham, NR20 4HA**  
(Proposed residential development (Two houses and garages)

DISMISSED

The Inspector concluded that the appeal site would not be an appropriate location for two further dwellings with regard to providing good accessibility by more sustainable modes of transport and for these reasons would be contrary to local and national planning policies. The Inspector also noted that the proposal would result in an uncharacteristic and rather incongruous suburban form of housing extending into the open countryside beyond the dissimilar low- density, more spacious two houses adjacent. The proposal would not relate

well to the existing pattern of very limited and sporadic development and neither be an example of infill or rounding off. The proposal would be quite prominent and have a harmfully suburbanising impact, at odds with the rural character of the surrounding area. The appeal was accordingly dismissed by the Inspector.

**3PL/2015/0589/O- Land North of Dereham Road, Mattishall, Norfolk** (Residential development of up to 16 dwellings including access with all matters reserved)

DISMISSED

The Inspector considered the four main issues of consideration were (i) The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area (ii) Whether or not the proposed development would be at an unacceptable risk of flooding (iii) The effect of the proposed development on highway safety with particular regard to the suitability of the access: and (iv) Whether or not the appeal site is an appropriate location for new housing having regard to the Development Plan and the Council's Supply of housing. The Inspector concluded that the proposed development would fail to comply with Policies CP11, DC1 and DC16 of the Local Plan and Policy HOU4 of the Neighbourhood Plan. Amongst other things, these policies seek to ensure that new development should be of the highest quality and fully consider the context within which it sits. In terms of flood risk, the proposed development would be at an unacceptable risk of flooding. Such that it would fail to accord with policy DC13 of the Local Plan and the relevant paragraphs of section 14 of the Framework. Together, and amongst other things, these policy approaches seek to ensure that new development should be located in areas at least risk of flooding. With regards highway safety the Inspector found the scheme acceptable. In terms of the appropriate location given the unacceptable risk of flooding and development causing harm to the character and appearance of the area the Inspector concluded that the benefits would be significantly and demonstrably outweighed. For the purposes of the Framework therefore, the appeal scheme would not represent sustainable development for which the presumption in favour applies. The Inspector's concluded that the appeal site would not be an appropriate location for new housing and the appeal was accordingly dismissed.