

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 August 2016

by Jonathan Price BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI DMS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 12th September 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/A2525/W/16/3150025

55 Langwith Drive, Holbeach, Spalding PE12 7HQ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr John Edwards against the decision of South Holland District Council.
 - The application Ref H09-0043-16, dated 14 January 2016, was refused by notice dated 1 March 2016.
 - The development proposed is residential development (Re-application of H09-0815-15 following refusal).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The application was made in outline with all detailed matters reserved. Drawings for a two-bedroomed bungalow, showing elevations, floor plan, layout and means of access have been submitted. I have taken these to be for illustrative purposes and have dealt with this appeal on that basis.

Main Issues

3. The main issues in this case are:
 - The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.
 - Whether acceptable living conditions would be provided for existing and future occupiers, with particular regard to outside living space.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The host property at No 55 is a bungalow fronting onto Langwith Drive, with bungalows either side, and it backs onto a small cul-de-sac off this road. The proposal would occupy the rear part of the garden to No 55 which would provide it a means of access onto this cul-de-sac.
 5. Residential development of this rear garden area would result in a cramped and enclosed form of development that would be starkly at odds with the generally quite spacious frontage housing in this area. The illustrative plans for a two-bedroom bungalow, sited end-on to the rear boundary of No 55, demonstrates
-

how a dwelling here would be very much out of character with the prevailing pattern of the surrounding housing.

6. This proposal would lead to a cramped and incongruous form of development that would harm the character and appearance of this residential area. It would therefore not comply with South Holland Local Plan 2006 (LP) saved Policies HS4 and SG14 which seek to restrict housing to suitable sites where there would not be an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the locality.

Living conditions

7. The limited size of site would provide future occupants of any residential development here with only a very restricted amount of outside living area and would leave the host bungalow with a very small back garden. For this reason, this proposal would not provide acceptable living conditions for either the occupiers of the proposed development or for those of the host bungalow.
8. Whilst it is appreciated that the appellant is seeking accommodation for retirement this would not justify the limited private garden space that would remain for future occupiers of No 55 or the small amount that would be provided with this proposal. Although size of garden space is not one of the criteria specifically mentioned, this development would fail to comply with the aims of LP saved Policy SG17 which are to avoid development harming residential living conditions. The intention of this policy is consistent with the principle in the National Planning Policy Framework that planning decisions seek a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings.

Conclusion

9. The appellant has sought support for this proposal from the example of the house permitted nearby, between Nos 47 and 49, which has an access onto the same cul-de-sac. However, compared to this proposal, this dwelling benefits from a significantly larger plot of land which gives it a reasonable amount of garden space and so it provides acceptable living conditions and better reflects the pattern of the surrounding housing. This example provides little support to this proposal which must, in any case, be judged on its own, individual merits.
10. Residential development on this site would be out of keeping with, and be harmful to, the character and appearance of this area and fail to provide acceptable living conditions for future and existing occupiers. Therefore, having taken into consideration all other matters raised, I conclude that this appeal should be dismissed.

Jonathan Price

INSPECTOR