

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 March 2017

by Jonathan Price BA(Hons) DMS DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 6th April 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/D0515/W/16/3163966

5 Glendon Gardens, Leverington, Cambridgeshire PE13 5FA

- 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 Peter Parlett against the decision of Fenland District Council.
 - The application Ref F/YR16/0877/F, dated 4 February 2016, was refused by notice dated 21 November 2016.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a 2-storey, 3-bed dwelling with integral garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. Glendon Gardens is an estate of modestly-sized dwellings, built to a quite uniform medium-density throughout, containing a mixture of bungalows and chalets, with a few houses. A few of the homes are semi-detached but most are detached. The housing surrounds a large green space containing trees.
 4. The appeal property is the third in a row of chalet bungalows which run north-south and face onto a quite narrow unadopted drive, leading from the main estate road, which runs parallel with the A1101 Sutton Road from which Glendon Gardens takes its access. These dwellings face towards Sutton Road beyond this drive, and are separated from it by a tall close-boarded timber fence and planting along the highway verge.
 5. These three chalet bungalows have quite short back gardens which back onto the area of green space in the centre part of the estate. Unlike the first two chalet bungalows to its north, No 5 also has a quite substantial area of side garden to the south. Immediately beyond this side garden stands a pair of double garages, set back behind parking/turning spaces, that serve the first two dwellings in an adjacent terrace of three houses which are the last properties served by this cul-de-sac.
 6. The proposal is for a rectangular-shaped house sited perpendicularly within this side garden, with a roof hipped to each side and gable ends facing onto the drive and a short rear garden. The design would be a wider version of the gable fronted form of the adjacent house to the south, No 3. However, the
-

dwelling would have a very short and restricted back garden, much less than would remain for No 5 and those of the other dwellings along this drive. The integral garage, and the parking space proposed in front of the dwelling, would also not provide the same amount of space for manoeuvring cars that the other houses have. A further two parking spaces for visitors would be allocated in the adjacent section of landscape space between the drive and the fence along the main highway. Although gravelled and used for car parking this landscape strip does not offer convenient space to turn a car in this drive.

7. The restricted rear garden and inadequate vehicular manoeuvring space to the front demonstrates this to be a somewhat cramped and restricted site for an additional dwelling. The proposal would contrast with the generally more spacious arrangement of the housing within the major part of this estate and would detract from the pleasing degree of openness currently provided by this area of side garden, which provides visual relief between the existing chalets and the somewhat tighter grain of development provided by the terrace to the south.
8. The housing in this location is sited directly up to the edge of the drive and the dwellings have little or no front garden. The existing side garden to No 5 therefore provides a degree of openness which compensates for this arrangement and is consequently of value to the open character and appearance of this part of the estate.
9. A dwelling in this position would result in the loss of the visual relief provided by this gap in housing and the street scene would appear denser and more crowded. Along with its associated car parking, the dwelling proposed would therefore detract materially from the pleasant open character and appearance of this part of the estate. As a consequence, this scheme would not respond to and improve the character of the local built environment and for this reason quite clearly conflicts with the aims of Policy LP16 of the Fenland Local Plan 2014.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given, and having taken into account all other matters raised, I conclude therefore that the appeal should be dismissed.

Jonathan Price

INSPECTOR