
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 August 2020

by William Walton BA MSc Dip Env Law LLM CPE BVC MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28th September 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/B3030/W/20/3253844

9 Fisher Close, Collingham NG23 7SL

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant full planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr N Smith against the decision of Newark & Sherwood District Council.
 - The application Ref 19/02287/FUL, dated 30 September 2019, was refused by notice dated 3 April 2020.
 - The development proposed is a new single detached bungalow on land adjacent to 9 Fisher Close.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.
3. The appeal site is located at the end of a residential cul-de-sac in Collingham. The cul-de-sac contains small bungalows which face onto the road and sit closely side to side with one another. The plots occupied by the 2 bungalows at 9 Fisher Close and 10 Fisher Close facing each other at the base of the cul-de-sac are larger than the others along the close. Their front gardens occupy the space in between the 2 dwellings which is open bar for a single garage within the grounds of No 10.
4. The proposed development is for a 3-bedroom bungalow that would sit on what is currently a large lawn to the far side of No 9. According to the Appellant the appeal site would measure 434 square metres although, because the site has been defined as including much of the garden to the front of No 9 (see Site Location Plan & Site Block Plan Drawing No. 050-NS-A- A101 – April 2019), this is probably marginally above the true size. To the rear and side of the appeal site is the end of Blackburn Close. A footpath from here leads past the side of the appeal site to an area of public open space.
5. The proposed bungalow would be positioned such that it would be at right angles to No 9 with a gap in-between the front and side of the respective buildings of about 2 metres. It would sit forward of No 9 by almost the full length of the dwelling and would face down the cul-de-sac. It would be accessed via a shared driveway with No 9 from the end of the cul-de-sac. Some small trees and shrubs would be removed in order to facilitate construction of this driveway.

6. There would be a tapered strip of garden at the rear of the proposed bungalow of about 2 to 3 metres in width. The main garden would be to the side of the proposed bungalow and would be bounded at the end by a fence beyond which is another footpath, this one linking Blackburn Close to Barnfield Road. The garden would be approximately 10-15 metres in length. This would make it larger than the reduced rear garden at No 9.
7. The appeal dwelling would be no closer to its neighbour than the other bungalows are to their neighbours along Fisher Close. Furthermore, it would incorporate an area of garden that would be of similar size to those of the other properties along the cul-de-sac. In these respects, the proposal would respect the character and appearance of the area.
8. The proposed driveway would accommodate 2 cars. The approved drawing does not make clear where the boundary between the 2 plots would be located. Nevertheless, irrespective of the alignment of the boundary the front garden of one or both properties would be small in comparison to those of the neighbours, making for an incongruous appearance.
9. What would be, in effect, a shared front driveway would constitute a different access arrangement to those of the other dwellings along the cul-de-sac. It would dominate the front of the proposed property to the detriment of its neighbour, No 9, and would look rather odd and incongruous within the wider streetscene.
10. The development of the site for a bungalow would result in the view towards the base of the cul-de-sac being foreclosed on the odd numbered side. By virtue of its position the dwelling would sit considerably forward of the established building line which would significantly disrupt and harm the visual harmony along the cul-de-sac. Because of this, it would look incongruous and awkward in comparison to its immediate neighbour and to the other dwellings along the cul-de-sac.
11. In contrast to the appeal dwelling, the plans for the 2 dwellings approved on similar sized end and corner plots at 8 Pocklington Road (09/01803/FUL) and at 8 Monkswood Close (11/00862/FUL), to which I was referred, show that these proposals respect the building lines established by their neighbours. Thus, unlike the appeal proposal, these 2 dwellings would not jar with their neighbours.
12. Therefore, the proposed development would, by virtue of its position on the site, harm the character and appearance of 9 Fisher Close and that of the surrounding area. It would, therefore, fail to accord with Policy CP9 of the Council's Local Development Framework: Amended Core Strategy 2019 which seeks to ensure that new development is of a high standard and of an appropriate form that complements the existing built environment.
13. Furthermore, it would also fail to accord with Policy DM5(4) of the Council's Local Development Framework: Allocations and Development Management Development Plan Document 2013 which seeks to ensure that proposals for backland development are in-keeping with the general character of existing development within the area.

14. Finally, it would fail to accord with the advice set out at Paragraph 127c) of the National Planning Policy Framework that new development should be sympathetic to local character.

Other Matters

15. The proposed dwelling would have high standards of insulation and would incorporate renewable energy features. It would also be located close to established community facilities. Whilst these are considerations that support the proposal, they do not outweigh the harm that it would cause to the character and appearance of No 9 and the neighbouring area.

Conclusion

16. For the reasons set out above the appeal should be dismissed.

William Walton

INSPECTOR