

Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 8 December 2020 G Sibley MPLAN MRTPI

Decision by Chris Preston BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 January 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/R3705/W/20/3258573

Orchards, Bennetts Road North, Corley CV7 8BG

- 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 Dereck Beverley against the decision of North Warwickshire Borough Council.
 - The application Ref PAP/2020/0236, dated 19 May 2020, was refused by notice dated 20 August 2020.
 - The development proposed is new build bungalow.
-

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 Issues

3. The main issues are:
 - i. Whether the proposal would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt having regard to the revised Framework and any relevant development plan documents.
 - ii. Would the harm by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, be clearly outweighed by other considerations so as to amount to the very special circumstances required to justify the proposal.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Inappropriate development

4. Paragraph 143 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) identifies that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. Paragraph 145 states that new buildings should be regarded as inappropriate in the Green Belt, save for a limited number of exceptions. The exceptions include, under paragraph 145 (e), limited infilling in villages.
5. There is no specific definition of 'limited infilling' within the Framework or the North Warwickshire Local Plan Core Strategy (adopted 2014) (CS) and,

similarly, what constitutes a 'village' is not defined. The site is not located within any of the defined settlements referred to in Categories 1 – 4 in Policy NW2 of the CS and, in terms of planning policy, is outside of any defined settlement boundary within the countryside that is washed over by the Green Belt. However, category 5 of the policy identifies that there are settlements within the district that are washed over by the Green Belt where no settlement boundary has been identified. Whether any given settlement or location would amount to a 'village' is not specifically defined within the settlement hierarchy of the development plan.

6. Policy NW3 of the CS sets out the Council's approach to development in the Green Belt in more detail and states that infill boundaries will be brought forward to indicate where infill and limited redevelopment would be permitted. I understand that the Council is seeking to identify 'infill boundaries' within an emerging plan which has reached examination stage. The Council have indicated that village locations have been identified and that the appeal site falls outside an area where infill would be permitted. Notwithstanding that point, no extracts from the plan have been provided and it is not clear if there are any outstanding objections to it. As such, I can give little weight to emerging policy and it is necessary to exercise planning judgement to ascertain whether the proposal would amount to 'limited infilling' within a 'village'.
7. Infilling is normally associated with the completion of an otherwise substantial built up frontage of several buildings or at the very least, the consolidation of a largely built up area.
8. The site is located between two dwellings within a run of ribbon development along Bennetts Road North which is located to the north of Coventry but outside of the settlement boundary for the city. The site and the wider ribbon development is washed over by the Green Belt and other than the line of houses, there does not appear to be the services and facilities that would typically be associated with a village.
9. The prevailing character of the immediate area is semi-rural with rural roads featuring ribbons of primarily single depth residential development interspersed with fields and countryside. The site is located towards the end of a row of development on such a road. The dwellings either side of the appeal site create a built-up frontage and the site is capable of accommodating a single dwelling in such a way as to continue the built-up frontage. Accordingly, the proposal would fall within the scope of the 'limited infill' aspect of Paragraph 145 (e) of the Framework.
10. However, whilst there are other residential properties nearby, the presiding character around the site remains semi-rural. The site is physically and visually disconnected from Coventry as well as any other settlements nearby. Residents would have to travel to reach the services and facilities available in Coventry City centre or the suburbs to the north of Coventry. Given the separation and the absence of nearby local services or facilities, this leads me to conclude that the location of the infill would not be within a 'village' for the purposes of Paragraph 145 (e).
11. For the reasons outlined above, I do not consider that the appeal scheme represents a limited infill development in a village. It cannot therefore be

treated as being within the exceptions identified in paragraph 145 of the Framework. Consequently, I conclude that the proposal would not meet criterion (e) of paragraph 145 of the Framework.

12. Paragraph 145 (g) permits the infilling or complete redevelopment of previously developed land, whether redundant or in continuing use which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the existing development.
13. The appellant notes that there was a dwelling on the site that has since been demolished but the remains of foundations are still in place. Third party comments support that position and noted that the house was demolished in the late 1980s. Having viewed the site there is evidence of previous development in terms of the composition of the base material on the ground. As such, despite the site being presently free of built form, there was in all likelihood a dwelling on the site and I am satisfied that the site is previously developed land having regard to the definition within the Framework.
14. Nevertheless, the dwelling has been demolished and as such, the site is now open and undeveloped. The proposed dwelling would introduce new built form into the Green Belt where there is none above ground level. This would have a harmful impact upon the spatial openness of the Green Belt. Furthermore, whilst the site is bounded by hedgerows and the proposal would be a single storey dwelling with a garage, the buildings would be seen over the hedges as well as through the driveway for the proposed dwelling. As such, the proposal would have a greater impact on the visual openness of the Green Belt than the currently undeveloped site. As a consequence, the proposal would have a moderately adverse impact on the openness of the Green Belt.
15. The appellant also notes that the site could be considered previously developed land because it is garden land located outside of the built-up area. Notwithstanding whether or not the site is garden land, as noted above, the proposal would have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and as a result, the proposal would fail to meet criterion (g) of Paragraph 145 of the Framework.
16. Given that the proposal would infill the gap between two existing dwellings, and that the site represents previously developed land, I am satisfied that it would not result in encroachment in the countryside. Nonetheless, that does not affect my conclusions on whether the proposal amounts to inappropriate development, having regard to the specific criteria within paragraph 145 of the Framework.
17. Therefore, the proposed development would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt. Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances.

Would the harm by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, be clearly outweighed by other considerations so as to amount to the very special circumstances required to justify the proposal

18. The appellant has referred to paragraph 79 (e) of the Framework which permits isolated homes where the design of the dwelling is of exceptional quality in that

it is truly outstanding or innovative, reflecting the highest standards in architecture, and would help to raise standards of design more generally in rural areas; and would significantly enhance its immediate setting, and be sensitive to the defining characteristics of the local area.

19. Notwithstanding whether or not the dwelling would be truly outstanding or innovative, the proposed dwelling is located within run of ribbon development with dwellings either side of it. As such, it cannot be considered isolated in either a physical or a functional sense for the purposes of Paragraph 79 (e) of the Framework. Consequently, the proposal would fail to meet criterion (e) of the Paragraph 79 of the Framework.
20. The surrounding dwellings are a mix of two storey and single storey dwellings, some of which have garages and because the dwelling would be located within a run of ribbon development a single storey dwelling, with a garage, in this location would not appear out of character. Most of the dwellings locally are rendered, although the neighbouring dwelling is a red brick building. The proposed buff stone is not commonly used within the immediate street scene but its use here would not be unduly harmful given the existing range of materials used within the immediate area. The bungalow itself would include a central glass aperture which would separate the two side sections of the dwelling. This would create an interesting architectural feature that is not common within the area. Nonetheless, the built form either side of the glass aperture would have the appearance of a relatively standard bungalow, with some modern elements. Consequently, whilst the dwelling would be attractive, the design of the dwelling would not be exceptional. For this reason, a single storey dwelling with a garage would not appear out of character for the area and the appearance of the dwelling, whilst not exceptional, would not harm the character or appearance of the street scene. Nevertheless, good design would be an expectation of any development, having regard to local and national planning policy and this does not amount to a positive effect in favour of the proposal.
21. The appellant has provided an email where they have offered to contribute to a local project if the Council agreed. Whilst I note that offer, no legal agreement under section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 has been provided with the appeal and the email cannot be relied upon to guarantee any contribution. In any event, it would only be possible to take into account any contributions that are necessary to make a development acceptable in planning terms. In other words, matters that would be required to mitigate the harmful impact of the scheme. I can see no obvious connection between the suggested offer of a contribution to a local project and the harm that would arise in terms of inappropriate development within the Green Belt and the harm to the openness of the Green Belt. As such, I attach no weight to that matter.
22. The appellant, as well as third parties, note that because the site has been vacant it has been used for anti-social purposes and by developing the site, the proposal would stop such behaviour from taking place in the future. Whilst the proposal could stop the anti-social behaviour from taking place, a similar outcome could be reached through appropriate security measures around the site that would not require the erection of a permanent structure which harms the openness of the Green Belt. Accordingly, I attribute very limited weight to this consideration.

23. The appellant has referred to a number of residential applications and appeals that were allowed in the Green Belt. As set out by the Council, the approved applications and appeals were substantively different to these proposals, including extensions to existing dwellings and sites located in identified settlements in Policy NW2 of the CS. Because those proposals were in the Green Belt, the assessment of each proposal is site specific and conclusions, in terms of openness, are generally unique to each proposal. As such, there are limited comparisons that can be drawn between those schemes and this one. Furthermore, each case must be assessed on its own merits and the Council or the Planning Inspectorate permitting schemes elsewhere would not justify these proposals.
24. The appellant has highlighted that the dwelling would be a self-build project, although limited supporting information in that respect has been provided. However, I have no reason to doubt that position. The Council are required to keep a register of self-build plots and the proposed dwelling would help to the Council to deliver one additional self-build plot. To that end, I attach limited weight to this positive consideration.
25. The proposal would deliver an additional dwelling which would provide a modest contribution towards the Council's 5-year housing land supply and I attach limited weight to this positive consideration having regard to the scale of the development.

Conclusion and Green Belt balance

26. Paragraph 143 of the Framework identifies that inappropriate development in the Green Belt should not be approved except in very special circumstances. Paragraph 144 states that substantial weight must be given to any harm to the Green Belt and that very special circumstances will not exist unless that harm, and any other harm arising from the proposal, is clearly outweighed by other considerations. The proposed development would cause harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness and would result in a reduction in the openness of the Green Belt, which would conflict with one of the key purposes of designating land within the Green Belt and the relevant policies of the development plan. I attach substantial weight to those matters.
27. Whilst I have found no harm to the character and appearance of the area, that would be an expectation of any development and does not amount to a positive effect in favour of the proposal. On the other side, the redevelopment of the site would stop the site being used for anti-social behaviour and the proposed dwelling would contribute towards the Council's 5-year housing land supply and redevelop a previously developed site. To these considerations I collectively attach moderate weight.
28. The other considerations in support of the appeal do not, on balance, clearly outweigh the harm to the Green Belt. Consequently, the very special circumstances necessary to justify the development do not exist.
29. Having regard to the above, the identified conflict with the development plan and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

G Sibley

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

Chris Preston

INSPECTOR