

APPEALS SUMMARY- FEBRUARY

3PL/2016/1189/0

The Old Pitt, High Street, Whissonsett (Outline application for 4 dwellings)

DISMISSED

The Inspector concluded that the proposed development would have an adverse effect on the setting of the Church of St Mary, a Grade 11* listed building and that such effect would not be outweighed by the public benefits of the scheme. As such the proposal would conflict with the Framework and the Core Strategy Policy DC17. The Inspector also concluded that the lack of suitable private amenity space for Plots 1 and 4 of the proposal also added weight to the decision to dismiss the appeal.

3PL/2017/1057/F

Beckwood, Stacksford, Old Buckenham (Construction of a one and half storey dwelling)

DISMISSED

The Inspector concluded whilst the proposed development would provide some economic and social benefits consisting of employment during the construction period, some additional use of facilities in the surrounding settlements, the contribution to the housing shortfall and highway improvements. These benefits cumulatively do not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the harm arising from the location of the site in relation to the accessibility to local services and facilities. The appeal was accordingly dismissed.

3PL/2017/0894/Hou

6 The Wrens Thetford (repositioning of fence boundary)

ALLOWED

The Inspector noted that although the general character of the estate has a reasonable level of openness, there were several examples of boundary treatments and dwellings abutting the rear of the footpath throughout the estate. The Inspector considered that the proposed relocation of the fence would not be harmful to the openness nor result in a significant or harmful change to the character of the area. Furthermore, the relocated fence would sit in line with the existing hedge located directly to the north which would provide some screening and soften the overall visual impact of the new positioning. For the above reasons, the proposal would not result in undue harm to the character and appearance of the area and it therefore complies with the requirements of Policy DC16 of the Breckland Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document 2009. The appeal was allowed.