

APPEALS SUMMARY- MARCH 2019

3PL/2017/1599/F (88 Rayners Farm, Dereham Road, NR20 3NU) - Erection of two dwellings

DISMISSED

The Inspector concluded in the overall planning balance of the scheme that the proposal would be contrary to the Development Plan in that it would result in material harm to the character and appearance of the area, to which he afforded significant weight. The development would be at odds with the prevailing character of the area in that it would result in dwellings being sited directly behind and in close proximity to frontage dwellings, only to be separated by the proposed access and parking areas. The proposal would appear as a cramped and incongruous form of development that would suburbanise the site, eroding the rural qualities of the area, resulting in material harm to the character and appearance of the area, which would be clearly visible from Dereham Road. The development would be in conflict with Policies DC1 and DC16 of the Core Strategy and Policy HOU1 of the Mattishall Neighbourhood Plan, which seek, amongst other things, to ensure that developments preserve or enhance the existing character of an area and do not have an unacceptable impact on the amenities of the area. The appeal was accordingly dismissed.

3PL/2018/0088/F (Model Farm, Chapel Street, Rocklands, NR17 1UJ) Erection of two dwellings

DISMISSED

The Inspector considered the main issue was the effect on the development on the living conditions of the immediate adjoining neighbours in Model Farm and Brandy Well with particular reference to noise and disturbance associated with use of the access for vehicular movement and manoeuvring. The Inspector concluded that the occupiers of the adjacent properties would suffer from noise and disturbance from the proposal that would harm their living conditions to an unacceptable degree. Consequently the development would conflict with Policy DC1 of the Core Strategy which aims to ensure development does not unacceptably affect the residential amenity of neighbouring occupants. Whilst the Inspector noted that permission had recently been granted for a single dwelling on the site and was a material consideration. The Inspector considered that the proposed development for two dwellings would result in additional noise disturbance from the additional dwelling above and beyond that permitted and would make the resultant impact upon the living conditions of the neighbouring properties unacceptable.

3PL/2017/0885/O (Outline application for two dwellings & Garages) Land of Mill Drift, Beeston

DISMISSED

The Inspector concluded that the appeal site failed to provide a suitable site for housing, having regard to the proximity of services and would therefore conflict with Policies SS1, CP14 and DC2 of the DPD, which together set out locations for sustainable communities. The Inspector also considered that the proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area, although this harm would be minor given the low level of public

views to the site. In addition the Inspector concluded that the appeal would also have an unacceptable impact on highway safety. The proposal would conflict with policy CP4 of the DPD, which requires access and safety concerns regarding all new developments to be resolved. It would also consequently conflict with the Framework, which seeks to ensure that development provides safe and suitable access to the site.

In conclusion the Inspector found the harm to highway safety in the area would be unacceptable, the development would not lie in a suitable location housing and there would be minor harm to the character and appearance of the area. Overall, the adverse impacts of the proposal would significantly and demonstrably outweigh its benefits.

3PL/2018/1418/PIP (Threshing Yard, Hallfield Road, Thompson, Thetford) - Permission in principle for the demolition of barn and stables and the erection of 4 dwellings.

DISMISSED

The two main issues were the principle of the proposed development with specific regard to its location and its effect on the character and appearance of the area. The site is outside the settlement boundary of Thompson as it is defined by Policy CP14 of the Local Plan. In planning terms therefore, it is in the countryside. Thompson falls within the bracket of a rural settlement. These settlements, have little or no services, and are not capable of sustaining consequential growth. Policies DC2 and CP14 re-affirm that the development will be focussed within settlement boundaries. Thompson lacks a range of necessary services on which incumbent residents rely for day to day living. It has a primary school but is essentially dependent on nearby Watton, a mid-sized market town. Surrounding roads are narrow, of a rural nature and generally unlit without segregated pavements. With these factors and the travel distance in mind, the inspector concluded that the future occupiers of the appeal scheme would rely on the use of the private car as their main source of transport. The principle of the proposed development would not be acceptable.

The Inspector also concluded that the appeal scheme would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area contrary to policies CP11, DC1 and DC16 of the Core Strategy which seeks amongst other things and along with section 12 of the Framework, these policies seek to ensure that new development is contextually appropriate, has regard to the quality of the landscape and local character and is of a high quality. The appeal was accordingly dismissed.

An application for an award of costs was also made by the applicant's which was also dismissed by the Inspector.