
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 February 2018

by Amanda Blicq BSc (Hons) MA CMLI

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

Decision date: 12 March 2018

Appeal Ref: APP/A2525/W/17/3184614

215 Bridge Road, Sutton Road, Spalding PE12 9SL

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Andrew Lilley against the decision of South Holland District Council.
 - The application Ref H18-0358-17, dated 12 April 2017, was refused by notice dated 4 July 2017.
 - The development proposed is pair of semi-detached houses and one detached house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are:
 - The effect of the development on the living conditions of future occupiers with particular regard to noise and disturbance; and,
 - Whether the proposals represent overdevelopment of the site, with particular regard to parking arrangements.

Reasons

Living conditions

3. The appeal site is open land adjacent to 215 Bridge Road (No 215), which is a semi-detached dwelling fronting Bridge Road.
4. The development would comprise a pair of semi-detached (Plots 1 and 2) and one detached dwellings (Plot 3). The semi-detached dwellings would have two end to end parking bays beside their flank walls. There would be no turning space for these vehicles other than in front of those semi-detached dwellings. The detached dwelling would have two side by side parking bays located forward of its front elevation, whose turning space would also be in front of the semi-detached dwellings.
5. There does not appear to be any buffer or separation between the turning space in front of the semi-detached dwellings for vehicles manoeuvring in and out of the parking bays. This is confirmed by the appellant's diagram of the parking manoeuvres required for vehicles to leave the site in forward gear, which shows vehicles from Plot 3 turning very close to the front elevation of Plot 1 in order to exit the site.

6. Having reviewed the space available I conclude that multiple turns would be needed directly in front of Plots 1 and 2 for all vehicles to turn within the site. Furthermore, if both parking bays for Plots 1 and 2 were in use, access and egress from the inner bay would also require multiple turns and the temporary blocking of other parking bays on the site. I acknowledge that vehicles could leave the site in forward gear but this does not alter my reasoning in respect of excessive manoeuvring and proximity to the dwellings.
7. The appellant argues that the development would be similar to that of the development on the other side of 217 Bridge Road (No 217)¹. However, whilst the layout of the semi-detached dwellings and parking bays is similar to that of the appeal before me, there appears to be some, albeit limited, separation between the dwellings' front elevations and the turning area. As such the two developments are not entirely comparable. In any case, each appeal is determined on its merits.
8. I conclude that the manoeuvring of vehicles in a confined space and in proximity to the proposed dwellings would cause significant noise and disturbance for those occupiers, and this would be detrimental to their living conditions. This would be contrary to Policy SG14 (7) of the Local Plan² (LP) which states that consideration is to be given to the amenity of nearby residents in terms of noise and disturbance, amongst other considerations. It would also be contrary to Paragraph 17 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which seeks to secure a good standard of amenity for future occupiers of land and buildings.

Overdevelopment

9. The appellant argues that the development would be similar to the development next to No 217 but those dwellings appear to be on significantly larger plots. This observation is confirmed by the Council's comparison of the relative plot sizes of the two developments³. I conclude that the development would appear cramped as the parking bays and turning space would take up a disproportionate area of the site and would appear to dominate the frontage. In the absence of other concerns this would not necessarily be sufficient to warrant dismissal of the appeal, but my conclusions in this regard reinforce my reasoning in relation to the living conditions of future occupiers, as outlined above.
10. Consequently, the development would be contrary to the design aims of LP Policy SG14 of the Local Plan and in particular section (9) which states that the layout of vehicular access, parking and manoeuvring will be taken into consideration when assessing the design and layout of such development. It would also be contrary to the design aims of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which seeks to secure high quality design.

Planning balance

11. The appellant argues that the Council cannot demonstrate five years housing supply and the Council has not rebutted this assertion. However, even if this is the case and Paragraph 14 of the Framework is engaged, this does not automatically lead to a grant of planning permission. The development would

¹ Ref H18-0102-12

² South Holland Local Plan, adopted July 2006

³ Statement of Case

make a very limited contribution to local housing supply, and the adverse impacts of granting permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies of the Framework when taken as a whole. Overall the presumption in favour of sustainable development should not be applied.

Other matters

12. I appreciate that the application was recommended for approval but nonetheless members found harm in relation to the development, as have I. The appellant's argument in relation to the committee discussion weighs neither for nor against this appeal.
13. An interested party has raised a concern in relation to highway safety and visitor parking. However, as I have found harm in relation to the main issues it is not necessary for me to consider those matters further.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above and taking all matters into account, I conclude that the development would be contrary to the relevant policies of the Council's development plan and there are no material considerations of such weight as to warrant a decision other than in accordance with the aforementioned development plan. Consequently, the appeal should be dismissed.

Amanda Blicq

INSPECTOR