

APPEALS SUMMARY- SEPTEMBER

3PL/2017/0676/F- Development at the Ploughshare, The Street, Beeston, PE32 2NF
(Alterations to the The Ploughshare public house and a terrace of 3 Houses)

DISMISSED

The Inspector considered the main issues of consideration were (a) The effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area (b) The effect of the development on the living conditions of existing and future occupiers with particular regard to noise and disturbance (c) Whether the proposal would be acceptable having regard to Policies concerning key local services and facilities; and (d) The effect of the development on biodiversity.

The Inspector considered that the construction of a terrace of three dwellings would have an urbanising impact on the site and would erode the rural setting at this part of the village. He considered the proposed development would fail to reinforce the locally distinctive pattern of development and would have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the area and would be in conflict with Policy DC16 of the Breckland Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document 2009.

In addition the Inspector considered that significant levels of noise and disturbance would be experienced by future occupiers in conflict with Policy DC1.

The proposal also sought to remove the function room of the public house to allow it to trade more effectively. The Public House is registered with the council as an Asset of Community value by Beeston Community Enterprises Ltd. The removal of the function room would result in a floor area for the PH at some 65 sqm, which includes the bar area and snug room which is considered by the appellant to be the same size as numerous other village pubs. The Inspector reasoned that the removal of the function room would hinder the PH's ability to offer food, an area of entertainment or alternative use such as a local shop. The Inspector considered that the removal of the function room would reduce the viability of the public house and not increase it which was a concern raised by the Council's Economic Development Officer. The Inspector concluded that the development would also be in conflict with Policy DC18 which seeks to protect key services and community facilities from the development that could affect their viability.

With regards biodiversity the Inspector also noted that the proposal would fail to protect local biodiversity contrary to Policy CP10.

The Inspector concluded overall that the proposed development would have an unacceptable impact on the character and appearance of the area and would cause harm to the amenities of future occupiers of the proposed dwellings. Furthermore he concluded that the appellant had failed to demonstrate that the development would not impact on the viability of the public house or that potential biodiversity at the site would not be harmed. The appeal was accordingly dismissed.