



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 December 2019 by Darren Ellis MPlan

Decision by V Lucas LLB (Hons) MCD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 January 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/A3010/W/19/3235161

65 Blyth Road, Worksop, S81 0JR

- 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 Lee Nixon against the decision of Bassetlaw District Council.
 - The application Ref 19/00307/FUL, dated 27 February 2019, was refused by notice dated 13 May 2019.
 - The development proposed is to erect detached dwelling with detached single garage and construct new access.
-

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.

Procedural Matter

3. The description of the development on the application form is for a "New build development x1 to the side of the below address." The type of development is unclear from this description, so for clarity I have used the description of the development as shown on the appeal form and the LPA decision notice. This change to the description was agreed between the parties during the application process

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area, including whether the proposal will affect the setting of the Mr Straw's Conservation Area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal site forms part of the rear garden area of No 65 Blyth Road, situated on the corner of Blyth Road and Westfield Drive. The site is in a residential area that consists of a mix of detached and semi-detached houses and several bungalows, and is outside but adjacent to the Mr Straw's Conservation Area to the south and south-east of the site. The proposal would see the erection of a 1910's/20's-style bungalow and detached garage, with access to the plot from Westfield Drive.
-

6. The surrounding houses are set back from the street with front gardens that contribute to a green and open character to the frontages. As a consequence of the limited plot size, the proposed dwelling would not be set back from the street, and would therefore be set forward of the prevailing building line of the properties in Westfield Drive. The proposal would therefore appear as an obvious attempt to fit a dwelling into a constrained plot resulting in a visually contrived form of development.
7. Policy DM4 of the Bassetlaw District Local Development Framework – Core Strategy & Development Management DPD (CS) (December 2011) has two parts. Part A is specific for major developments, while Part B contains general design principles for individual development proposals, including single buildings. Part B of Policy DM4 requires, amongst other things, for development to have high-quality design that respects local character and distinctiveness.
8. The dwelling would be of a modest size and would largely respect the architectural style, features and materials of the area, and consequently would not detract from the setting of the Mr Straw's Conservation Area. Consequently the proposal would have a neutral effect on the setting of the nearby Conservation Area and would preserve the character or appearance of the Conservation Area.
9. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the proposed dwelling would cause harm to the character and appearance of the immediate street scene, and would be contrary to the objective of part B of Policy DM4 of the CS.

Other Matters

10. Whilst paragraph 59 of the National Planning Policy Framework refers to significantly boosting the supply of housing, the provision of one additional unit would make little meaningful difference. There would be a small social benefit in providing an extra housing unit, and economic advantages would also arise from the construction and occupation of a new house. I also acknowledge that the appeal site has no access issues in terms of local services. However, the harm to the character and appearance of the area identified would be significant and these matters do not outweigh that harm.
11. The appellant states that the proposal make much better use of the land available. Even if this were the case, I have no evidence before me to support this claim or to show that other less harmful uses are not possible.
12. The benefits that would arise from the proposal would not outweigh the harm that would be caused to the character and appearance of the area. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

Darren Ellis

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

13. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

V Lucas

INSPECTOR