



The Planning Inspectorate

An Executive Agency in the Department of the Environment and the Welsh Office

Room 1404
Tollgate House
Houlton Street
Bristol BS2 9DJ

Direct Line 0272-218927
Switchboard 0272-218811
Fax No 0272-218769
GTN 1374

East Midland Design Associates

Your Ref: 90/78

'Willow Lodge'

Horseshoe Road

SPALDING

Lincs

PE11 3JA

Our Ref:

T/APP/A2525/A/92/209956/P2

Date:

22 OCT 92

Gentlemen

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990, SECTION 78 AND SCHEDULE 6
APPEAL BY MR W J BENSON
APPLICATION NO HO 7/1352/91

1. I have been appointed by the Secretary of State for the Environment to determine the above mentioned appeal. This appeal is against the decision of the South Holland District Council to refuse outline planning permission in respect of an application for residential development on land adjacent to Grove House, North Road, Gedney Hill, Spalding. I have considered the written representations made by you and by the Council and also those made by the Gedney Hill Parish Council and interested persons including those made directly to the Council and forwarded to me. I inspected the site on 29 September 1992.

2. The planning application was submitted in outline but details of the siting of 3 dwellings, the means of access to the site and the landscaping were included. I shall therefore deal with the appeal on the basis that these matters are not reserved for later consideration.

3. The site lies on the east side of North Road in the village of Gedney Hill. The main part of the site is at present occupied by a group of agricultural buildings which are partly used for the storage of agricultural implements. A previous planning application for 3 dwellings on the site was refused planning permission and the subsequent appeal dismissed (T/APP/A2525/A/91/184693/P5). The Inspector concluded that the proposed development would be unsympathetic to the appearance of the locality and the village as a whole and would conflict with the Council's informal policy and advice in PPG 3. He also took into account that the proposals would result in an unacceptable risk to a preserved Ash tree.

4. The present proposals show 3 smaller dwellings in a revised position with a dense landscaping screen along the

boundary of the site with Willow Cottage. The access has been repositioned to avoid damage to the Ash tree. From my inspection of the site and its surroundings and from the representations I consider the main issue in this case is the effect of the proposals on the character and appearance of the locality having regard to the policies in the Structure Plan.

5. The approved Lincolnshire Structure Plan seeks to concentrate development in towns and larger villages. The Plan states that in other settlements, small-scale residential development will normally be permitted having regard to its impact on the nature, scale and density of existing development in the village. The Council have approved an Interim Boundary of Development (IBD) for Gedney Hill to assist in applying the Structure Plan policies on a consistent basis. In an accompanying statement, it is explained that apart from the areas identified as appropriate for development in depth, the IBD has been drawn to provide a notional depth of about 30 m to permit frontage development only. Although the IBD does not form part of a statutory plan, I regard it as a material consideration to which I can give some weight.

6. Gedney Hill appears to have a structure typical of a Fenland village with residential development in linear form aligned with the drainage channels. It is clearly the Council's intention to maintain this structure so far as possible. Your client's proposals differ in layout from the earlier scheme, with 3 smaller bungalows sited more or less parallel to North Road. It is also proposed to provide a dense landscaping screen along the front of the site, including a Hawthorn hedge.

7. I accept that the 3 bungalows would lie within the IBD which along this length of North Road is some 60 m from the road, although the rear gardens would extend beyond the boundary. I also accept that the proposed screening would reduce the visual impact of the development when seen from North Road. Despite the changes to the previous scheme, the proposed development still represents a form of backland development and in my view this would be atypical of the village. As such I consider it would be both harmful in itself and if repeated on other sites would cumulatively add to the harm and undermine the Council's interim policy for the village. Like my colleague on the previous occasion, I consider that the proposals do not accord with the advice in PPG 3. This has been revised since the previous decision and now states in Paragraph 19 that the character of the settlement should always be respected.

8. I have taken account of all other matters raised including the views of the Gedney Hill Parish Council and concerns expressed by local residents about the proposed access. I do not consider that the proposed access would give rise to any traffic problems. However in my opinion neither this nor any other matter outweighs the considerations that have led to my conclusions.

9. For the above reasons, and in exercise of the powers transferred to me, I hereby dismiss this appeal.

I am Gentlemen
Your obedient Servant

Peter Watson

A P WATSON BSc(Econ) DipTP FRTPI MBIM
Inspector

Town and Country Planning Act 1990

Refusal of Planning Permission

Reference: H07/1352/91

Received: 18-DEC-91 Type: OUTLINE

Name: Mr W J Benson
Flint Cottage
55 Lynn Road
Great Bircham
Kings Lynn NORFOLK

Agent: E. M. D. A.
"Willow Lodge"
Horseshoe Road
Spalding
Lincs

Description: Residential Development

Location : Adjacent to Grove House North Road
Gedney Hill Spalding

South Holland District Council hereby give notice that PERMISSION HAS BEEN REFUSED for the development for the following reason(s):

- 1 The established character of this part of the village is essentially that of frontage development, and to permit the development of three dwellings on what is a backland site, which extends outside the boundary of development of the village, would be detrimental to the established village character and establish a precedent for further backland development on sites in the village, which the District Council have identified as being suitable for frontage development only. The proposal is also considered to be contrary to advice contained within Planning Policy Guidance Note 3, 1988 (Land for Housing).

Director of Planning and Building Control Services
18-FEB-92 H07/1352/91

This decision refers only to that required for the purposes of the Town and Country Planning Act and not for Building Regulations or any other legislation. See enclosed notes relating to rights of appeal.

