
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 August 2019

by Mr A Thickett BA(Hons) BTP Dip RSA MRTPI

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

Decision date: 22 October 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/A3010/W/19/3229059

Willow Croft, The Green, Beckingham, Nottinghamshire, DN10 4NL

- 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 & Mrs Hutt against the decision of Bassetlaw District Council.
 - The application Ref 19/00121/RSB, dated 25 January 2019, was refused by notice dated 12 April 2019.
 - The development proposed is a new dwelling including a new double garage and a new access (and demolition of the existing garage).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the impact of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. Willow Croft sits in a substantial plot and the appellant proposes to construct a new dwelling in the rear garden. The existing garage to the east side of the house would be demolished to facilitate access and a new garage built on the other side of the existing house with a new drive.
4. There is variety in the dwellings around The Green and I do not consider that, in relation to its design, the proposed dwelling would look out of place. However, the pattern of development is predominantly buildings facing The Green. There are exceptions including two bungalows to the rear of Fair View but the Block Plan submitted with the appeal application shows that a building previously existed to the rear of Fair View.
5. The appellant cites the granting of planning permission in 2016 for the demolition of the existing bungalow and the erection of 4 detached houses on the site. However, I agree with the Council that one cannot compare a comprehensive redevelopment with the ad hoc insertion of a large new building in a back garden.
6. Although set well back from the street, the proposed 1.5 storey house and double garage would be substantial structures and would be visible from The Green. I consider that the proposed backland development would be at odds with the prevailing built form and that, as a result, it would have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the area. I conclude, therefore,

that the proposal conflicts with Policy DM4 of the Bassetlaw Core Strategy and Development Management DPD.

Other matters

7. The appellant does not dispute the Council's assertion that the District has a 7.9 year housing land supply. The Council accepts that as its Core Strategy is more than 5 years old and has not been reviewed, its strategy in relation to settlements is out of step with the Framework. The Council considers that, as a consequence, the weight to be given to the settlement hierarchy in Policy CS1 is reduced and the tilted balance engaged.
8. The National Planning Policy Framework advises that where the most relevant development plan policies are deemed to be out of date, planning permission should be granted for sustainable development unless any adverse impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies of the Framework.
9. The Core Strategy identifies Beckingham as a rural service centre (Policy CS1) suitable for limited growth (Policy CS8). These policies identify Beckingham as a sustainable location for new housing and weigh in favour of the appeal proposal. However, the design and development principles set in Policy DM4 accord with the Framework's aim of achieving well designed places. I have concluded that the proposal conflicts with this policy. Further, notwithstanding that Beckingham is recognised as a sustainable location for new housing, I agree with the Council that the benefits of building one house here, both in relation to the supply of housing and to the local economy are demonstrably outweighed by the harm described above.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above and having regard to all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Anthony Thickett

Inspector