



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 October 2019 by L Wilson BA (Hons) MA

Decision by A U Ghafoor BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 October 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/N2535/W/19/3233757

25 Marlow Road, Gainsborough, DN21 1YG

- 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 Nigel Sutton against the decision of West Lindsey District Council.
 - The application Ref 138984, dated 1 February 2019, was refused by notice dated 11 April 2019.
 - The development proposed is described on the application form as *a two bedroom dormer bungalow on site adjacent to 25 Marlow Road, Gainsborough*.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The effect of the proposal upon: 1) character and appearance of the street scene, and 2) the living conditions of the occupants of no. 25 and 27 Marlow Road, with particular reference to outlook.

Reasons for the Recommendation – *Character and Appearance*

4. No. 25 is a detached bungalow situated in a large plot. The street scene is characterised by a mix of two-storey dwellings and bungalows. Properties are set back from the highway behind a front garden and driveway generally leading to a garage. The new dwelling would be seen as a two-storey property located between two bungalows. The form of the new dwelling would be similar to those highlighted in Figure 6 of the appellant's grounds of appeal. However, these properties are set within larger plots as they have a garage to the side and thus cannot be directly compared to the proposal.
5. The character of properties along Marlow Road vary, but it is characterised by rows of similarly designed buildings displaying a strong simple rhythm. The development would result in a narrow plot which would appear out-of-keeping with the character of the row of bungalows, which are set within generous plots. Within the context of the neighbouring properties the scheme would

appear cramped. The height of the new dwelling and siting in front of no. 25 and 27 would exacerbate this.

6. The appellant has provided a copy of the deeds for the plot, but these do not justify visually harmful development. In addition, the appellant considers the proposal would enhance the scale and mix of housing types and create a range of new job opportunities. One new dwelling would not have a significant impact and thus has little bearing on the planning merits of the case.
7. Whilst the site is located close to local services, the proposal would not accord with the National Planning Policy Framework (the 'Framework') or Policy LP2 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan (2017) (LP) as it would cause harm to the character and appearance of the street scene. The proposal would also conflict with Policies LP17 and LP26 of the LP.

Living Conditions

8. The Council state the separation distance between the new dwelling and the side windows of no. 25 and 27 would be approximately 9.4 metres and 7.5 m respectively. In addition, the new dwelling would be located approximately 6.4 m from no. 25's patio doors and flanking windows and 6.7 m from no. 27's glazed door on the front elevation. The appellant does not dispute these distances.
9. There would be an adequate gap between the new dwelling and the side windows to ensure that the development would not have an adverse effect upon the outlook of these windows. Similarly, the front facing windows and doors would not be unduly affected as views of the new dwelling would be limited due to the proposed gap between the dwellings and the windows look towards the highway.
10. For these reasons, the proposed development would not have an adverse effect on occupiers' living conditions. Therefore, it would not conflict with Policy LP26 of the LP and with the Framework.

Conclusion and Recommendation

11. Although I have found that the scheme would not have an adverse effect upon the living conditions of occupants of no. 25 and 27, this is outweighed by the harm to the character and appearance of the street scene to which I attach significant weight. For the reasons given above, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

L M Wilson

APPEALS PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

12. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report, and, on that basis, I too agree and conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

A U Ghafoor

INSPECTOR