



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 December 2020

by Graham Wright BA(Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5 January 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/D0515/W/20/3256347

Land East of 12 Norman Way, Wimblington PE15 0QB

- 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 Ms Linsey Wadsworth against the decision of Fenland District Council.
 - The application Ref F/YR20/0274/F, dated 05 March 2020, was refused by notice dated 17 June 2020.
 - The development proposed is a new 2 bed bungalow.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site sits in a prominent position on the corner of Norman Way and Fullers Lane. Its prominence in the street scene is further increased due to its close proximity to a curve in Meadow Way. Norman Way forms part of a wider estate of single storey bungalows. The estate has a spacious feel, with a number of areas of open space present, including diagonally opposite the appeal site on Meadow Way. The prevalence of these open areas contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area. The dwellings on Fullers Lane are two storey in height and positioned tightly to the road, forming the backdrop to the appeal site.
4. In views taken towards the appeal site from both along Norman Way and from along Meadow Way, the appeal site provides visual consistency in the context of the estate in which it sits. When viewed from Fullers Lane, the openness of the appeal site is also visually consistent with the character and appearance of the estate that lies beyond it. The introduction of the proposal onto the site would erode the benefit that the appeal site brings to the respective street scenes, resulting in the loss of its open and spacious feel and introducing a built feature that would appear visually cramped in its locality. This would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the area.
5. Furthermore, the Norman Way street scene is characterised by semi-detached bungalows of a uniform design and spacing. The fact that the proposal would be

a detached bungalow with a different front elevation would accentuate the harm that the proposal would have by visually setting it apart from the existing street scene.

6. The appellant questions both the quality and the designation of the area of land on the opposite side of Meadow Way which the Council refers to as public open space, and whether it can be considered to be an important space within the village as referred to in Policy LP12 of the Fenland Local Plan 2014 (LP). However, it is the role the land plays in defining the visual context in which the appeal site sits that is the key consideration, as opposed to its specific quality or formal designation.
7. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposal would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the area. Consequently, it would fail to accord with Policy LP16 of the LP where it seeks to protect character and appearance.

Other Matters

8. Whilst the appeal site is located within an established settlement with good access to facilities and services and there is support for the growth of Wimblington in Policy LP3 of the LP, this does not outweigh the significant harm that would be caused to the character and appearance of the area. Likewise, although there is support for the promotion of small housing sites in the National Planning Policy Framework, this too does not outweigh the harm that would arise.
9. The appellant refers to a previous withdrawn planning application, to pre-application advice that they received and to the fact that amendments were made to the proposed scheme during the course of the planning application which is subject to this appeal. However, I must determine the appeal on its own merits and on the basis of the proposal that is before me.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Graham Wraight

INSPECTOR