



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 January 2020

by Paul Cooper MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 31 January 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/B3030/W/19/3236718

15 Cheyne Drive, Bilsthorpe, Nottinghamshire NG22 8SB

- 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 G Powell against the decision of Newark & Sherwood District Council.
 - The application Ref 19/00768/FUL, dated 23 April 2019, was refused by notice dated 3 July 2019.
 - The development proposed is erection of a dormer bungalow with existing access and driveway from Archers Drive, and erection of a new boundary wall.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. I have used the description of development as set out on the Council's Decision Notice, which sets out the development in a more concise manner than the narrative set out on the application form. I note that the appellant has used the same description on the appeal form and therefore I am satisfied that there is no prejudice to the interests of either party.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this case is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is land to the rear of No 15 Cheyne Drive, at a significantly lower site level. It currently contains an outbuilding on site, which is located adjacent to the boundary with No 1 Archers Drive. A variety of boundary treatments enclose the site, which is also used for the parking of vehicles.
5. The proposal would see the construction of a two bedroomed dormer bungalow, brick built, with concrete tiled roof. Two parking spaces would be retained on site. In addition, the appeal proposal seeks the retention of a boundary wall adjacent to No 15 Cheyne Drive. The bungalow would be sited approximately 1.5m from the side boundary with No 1 Archers Drive, 3.2m from the boundary with No 15 Cheyne Drive and 3.1m from the rear boundary of the appeal site.
6. The Council have raised no concerns in relation to the boundary wall and I see no reason to differ from this view. As a result, I will not consider this aspect of the proposals any further.

7. The distances to three of the site boundaries would be restricted, giving the appearance of overdevelopment and a building cramped into the corner of the appeal site. The design of the development would also introduce an uncharacteristic building form in an area of traditional bungalow properties. The introduction of a dwelling on this site, against the prevailing pattern of development, in a prominent position and not in alignment with any building lines in the established grain of development, would be harmful to the character and appearance of the street scene and the wider area. Consequently, the development would be out of character with the prevailing grain of development, and by virtue of the distance from site boundaries, would appear, in this context, to be cramped within the site.
8. Consequently, I consider that neither the form nor the positioning of the development would relate satisfactorily to its context, and it would be particularly cramped within the site. In the light of this, I find that the proposals would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area, and as a result the development would be contrary to Policy CP9 of the Newark & Sherwood Amended Core Strategy, adopted March 2019 (the CS) and Policy DM5 of the Allocations & Development Management Development Plan Document (2013) (the DPD) which collectively state, amongst other matters, that development should demonstrate an effective use of land that optimises site potential at a level suitable to local character, and should reflect the distinctiveness and character of the district reflected in the scale, form, mass, layout, design, materials and detailing of new development.

Other Matters

9. I have noted the comments of the appellant in relation to other sites that have gained consent in the locality. I do not have full details of those cases in front of me. However, whilst there are some factors that would appear similar to the proposed development, the examples are located in different areas with different development and locational characteristics to the appeal scheme. In any event, I am required to deal with this proposal on its own merits and, as such, I accord them limited weight.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, the appeal is dismissed.

Paul Cooper

INSPECTOR