



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 February 2020

by D Hilton-Brown BSc (Hons) CIEEM

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 05 March 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/D2510/W/19/3238869

New Trend Holiday Park, Ancaster Avenue, Chapel St Leonards PE24 5SN

- 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 New Trend Holiday Park against the decision of East Lindsey District Council.
 - The application Ref N/031/01300/19, dated 11 July 2019, was refused by notice dated 11 September 2019.
 - The development proposed is for improvements to 19 holiday chalets by constructing new pitched roofs over existing flat roofs and new external cladding to walls.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The council have not raised any objection in regard to the installation of the external cladding onto the holiday chalets. They have only given the chalets' proposed increase in roof height as a reason for refusal. Therefore, I have assessed the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring properties on the south side of Crown Avenue, with regard to outlook and sunlight.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is an existing holiday chalet park, which is bordered on all sides by residential properties. This appeal would result in alterations to the roofs and the installation of new external cladding to 19 of the existing chalets. These are situated along the northern boundary running parallel with the south side of Crown Avenue.
5. The development would require the construction of new roofs, with a pitch of approximately 18 degrees, over the existing flat roofs of these chalets. The height to the eaves would remain the same, but the height to the ridgelines would increase by approximately 0.8m for proposed type 'A' and 1.1m for type 'B' chalets.
6. The appeal chalets are located in close proximity to the residential bungalows on the south side of Crown Avenue. The bungalows are situated in small south

facing gardens and have habitable rooms with windows facing directly onto this row of holiday chalets.

7. There is a mix of boundary treatments along this northern border with the holiday park. Most are kept reasonably low, allowing the occupants of the bungalows to take advantage of the south facing aspect, permitting sunlight into both the gardens and habitable rooms to the rear of these bungalows. Whilst the actual distances and boundary treatments vary, the general relationship is such that the new chalet roofs would be highly visible to the occupiers of the bungalows and dominate their outlook.
8. I acknowledge that the increase in height and pitch of the chalet roofs would be modest. I also recognise that the configuration and angle of many of the chalets would allow some outlook between these structures. However, the extremely close proximity of these chalets to both each other and the bungalows, would undoubtedly result in the new roofs reducing the existing outlook to an unacceptable level for the occupiers of some of these bungalows.
9. Furthermore, as the chalets are situated directly to the south of the bungalows, the proposed roofs would also reduce the amount of sunlight that many of these properties would receive to both their gardens and habitable rooms. This would be particularly apparent in the winter months when the sun is low in the sky.
10. I consider that the new external cladding and roofs would be an enhancement to the chalets. I have also taken into consideration that the proposed pitched roofs would improve energy efficiency and match the appearance of the other chalets and new units, which were granted approval in January 2019. However, whilst acknowledging the benefits that would result in this respect, these are not sufficient to outweigh the significant harm I have identified.
11. I also acknowledge the appellant's efforts to consult with the neighbouring residents on Crown Avenue and to the fact that only one objection was received. Notwithstanding, I do not consider that this provides justification for the harm I have highlighted above.
12. I therefore conclude that the proposed new chalet roofs would have a detrimental effect on the outlook and sunlight for the occupiers of the neighbouring bungalows on the south side of Crown Avenue. Consequently, the proposal would fail to comply with to SP10 of the East Lindsey Local Plan, Core Strategy (Adopted July 2018) and paragraph 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework. Together these require development to be well designed in relation to residential living conditions.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons detailed above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude the appeal should be dismissed.

D Hilton-Brown

INSPECTOR