



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 February 2020 by Darren Ellis MPlan

Decision by Susan Ashworth BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17th March 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Z2505/W/19/3239043

106 Robin Hoods Walk, Boston, PE21 9LQ

- 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 C Blazhef against the decision of Boston Borough Council.
 - The application Ref B/19/0116, dated 18 March 2019, was refused by notice dated 30 September 2019.
 - The development proposed is demolition of outbuilding & store & erection of new dwelling & formation of new vehicular 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.

Main Issue

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

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site comprises a part of the existing rear garden of 106 Robin Hoods Walk, and currently houses a large metal shed. The proposal seeks permission for the demolition of the shed and the erection of a detached dwelling, accessed by a path in between Nos 104 and 106 Robin Hoods Walk, and with car parking spaces provided in between the front gardens of these properties.
 5. Robins Hood Walk is characterised by detached bungalows that front onto the street. The proposed dwelling would not be in keeping with this pattern of development as it would lie in a 'backland' position and would not front onto the street. The dwelling would be significantly taller than the adjacent bungalows and would therefore be highly visible from the street. Furthermore, it would reduce the openness between the surrounding properties.
 6. There are a number of outbuildings in the rear gardens of the properties along Robin Hoods Walk, however these buildings are of a limited scale and are single storey in height. The proposed dwelling would be considerably larger than these outbuildings.
-

7. Overall, the proposed dwelling would not be in keeping with the street scene and would detract from the character and appearance of the area. I accept that the height is necessary to mitigate flood risk, however this does not justify the harm that would be caused to the character and appearance of the area.
8. There is a new development of four 1.5-storey dwellings on a corner plot at the junction with Sheriff Way, north of the appeal site. These dwellings are taller than the other buildings along this stretch of Robin Hoods Walk. However, these new dwellings front onto Sheriff Way and act as a link between the bungalows of Robin Hoods Walk and the two storey properties along Sherwood Avenue. Furthermore, they have frontages directly onto the street and as such are not directly comparable to the scheme before me.
9. I acknowledge that the dwelling at No 100A is a 'backland' development. However, this bungalow has a hipped roof and a lower ridge height than the proposed dwelling. Both of these features lessen the visual impact of the dwelling so that it respects the character of the street.
10. For these reasons, the proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area and therefore would be contrary to policies 2 and 3 of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan (2019), which, amongst other things, require high quality design and that development is appropriate to the site.

Planning Balance and Conclusion

11. The loss of the garage would represent a visual improvement to the site itself although given the proposed replacement dwelling would cause harm to the character of the area, this carries limited weight. Whilst the proposal would provide a new dwelling, the provision of one additional unit would make little meaningful difference to the overall housing supply in the area. 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. However, these benefits would be limited and would carry only moderate weight in support of the proposal.
12. The Council raises no concerns regarding the effect of the proposal on neighbouring properties, the effect on the future occupiers of the dwelling, highway safety or any other matter, and I have no reason to disagree with this. I also accept that the site is in a sustainable location with regards to local facilities and public transport. However, these are neutral matters in the planning balance.
13. Given that the benefits of the scheme are limited, they do not outweigh the harm to the character and appearance of the area I have identified, harm that carries significant weight against the proposal.
14. For the reasons given above, and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

D Ellis

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

S Ashworth

INSPECTOR