



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 November 2020 by L Wilson BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

Decision by K Taylor BSc (Hons) PGDip MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 November 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/M2515/W/20/3256404

Land at 14 Bardney Close, Lincoln LN6 0AL

- 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 A Gilbert against the decision of City of Lincoln Council.
 - The application Ref 2020/0323/FUL, dated 29 May 2020, was refused by notice dated 7 July 2020.
 - The development is a proposed dwelling.
-

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.

Preliminary Matters

3. I observed on my site visit that building work had started, including alterations to the front elevation, the formation of off-street parking and the subdivision of the plot. For clarity, I have considered the appeal on the basis of the drawings that were before the Council when they determined the planning application.

Main Issue

4. The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. No. 14 is a two-storey end of terrace property situated on a corner plot in a short cul-de-sac. The cul-de-sac has a strong pattern of development with blocks of five terraced properties to either side and a block of four terraced properties at the head of the cul-de-sac. The wider area is characterised by terraces and semi-detached dwellings.
6. The appeal site relates to the side garden of No. 14 which is clearly visible from both Croxton Drive and Belton Avenue. The eastern side of Croxton Drive, including the appeal site, positively contributes to the area because there is a consistently large gap between properties and the highway which provides a sense of spaciousness. Corner plots throughout the surrounding area generally have large side gardens.

7. The appearance of the dwelling would be similar to terraces within the local area in terms of the set-in design to the front and rear elevation, width, depth and window configuration. The plot size of both the existing and new dwelling would also be comparable to plots within the cul-de-sac.
8. However, the introduction of a new dwelling to the side of No. 14 would harmfully disrupt the symmetry of the cul-de-sac and would not reflect the established strong pattern of development. The new dwelling would project beyond the building line of No. 1 Bardney Close (No. 1), opposite the appeal site. The scheme would also not respect the building line of Croxton Drive. It would erode an important gap and reduce the sense of openness of both the site and surrounding area. Accordingly, due to the siting of the new dwelling in a prominent location, it would appear at odds with the carefully planned pattern of development.
9. As set out in the procedural matters section above, the parking area to the front of the existing property has already been implemented. From the evidence before me, it appears that when the application was submitted No. 14 did not benefit from off-street parking. Within the cul-de-sac and the surrounding area there is a mix of on and off-street parking arrangements. In general, where dwellings benefit from off-street parking, a proportion of the front garden is retained so that the area is not dominated by hard surfacing.
10. The parking area for the existing property would appear starker than those in the surrounding area, including the cul-de-sac, given the extent of hard surfacing and because it would erode all of the front garden. The off-street parking would be seen in conjunction with No. 13's and would result in this section of the street scene being dominated by hard surfacing which is uncharacteristic of the area. The new parking area further exacerbates the lack of symmetry of the scheme with No. 1 which does not have a driveway. Hence, although the parking area would be beneficial to the occupier, it would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area because of the extent of hard surfacing with no vegetation or grass to soften its impact.
11. The parking area for the new dwelling would be to the rear and would have less of an impact upon the surrounding area. It would be similar to that at No. 40 Anderby Drive and No. 27 Gunby Avenue. These properties have driveways off Croxton Drive which do not dominate the street scene as they are softened by the adjacent private amenity space. The scheme would therefore be acceptable in this regard.
12. The Council are concerned that the location of the bin storage would be harmful. On my site visit I observed that a large number of properties had bins stored to the front. The appellant asserts that the bins would be stored to the rear and on collection days the occupier would move the bins to the front. The proposed drawing shows a path at the bottom of the garden to allow access to the rear garden of the existing property. I am satisfied that details regarding refuse storage could be conditioned for the existing and new dwelling and that the scheme would be acceptable in this respect.
13. The appellant has highlighted properties within the local area which benefit from a two-storey side extension, including corner plots. The scale and massing of these two-storey extensions is significantly different to the scheme before me which introduces a new dwelling with two new off-street parking areas. Moreover, predominantly two-storey extensions within the local area read as

subordinate additions through the use of a set-back, or by having a smaller width than the host property or a lower ridge height. Thus, the extensions cannot be directly compared to the scheme before me and in any event each application must be considered on its own individual planning merits.

14. For these reasons, the proposed development would be visually harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area. Consequently, it would conflict with Policy LP26 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan (2017) and the Framework which collectively seek, amongst other matters, to achieve high quality design that contributes positively to local character.

Other Matters

15. The appellant states that the scheme would contribute to housing stock. One new dwelling would not have a significant impact upon the supply of housing and thus has little bearing on the planning merits of the case.

Conclusion and Recommendation

16. For the reasons given above I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

L M Wilson

APPEALS PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

17. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report, and, on that basis, I agree and conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

K Taylor

INSPECTOR