



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 February 2021

by Martin Chandler BSc MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4 March 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/E2530/W/20/3262693

6 Ermine Close, Bourne PE10 9XH

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr David Lewis against the decision of South Kesteven District Council.
 - The application Ref S20/1337, dated 6 August 2020, was refused by notice dated 6 October 2020.
 - The development is proposed creation of single storey dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The original planning application was made in outline form with all matters reserved for future consideration. I have therefore assessed the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal site is located within a short cul-de-sac and forms part of the garden of an existing bungalow. The existing building is one of nine similar properties that are laid out around the turning head and which are comparably set back from the highway. Although the layout is not entirely uniform, the consistency of spacing between the buildings and the well-defined building lines combine to establish a strong sense of enclosure within the turning head. The collection of bungalows all contribute to this sense of enclosure and as a consequence, the turning head is framed in a manner which makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area.
5. Based on the indicative information before me, the proposal would seek to introduce a bungalow of a comparable footprint to the existing buildings within the close. However, due to the positioning of Nos 5 and 6, any new dwelling would be required to be set substantially further back from the highway, demonstrably beyond the strong building line identified above. As a consequence, such a location would significantly contrast with the well-considered layout found within the close. It would also fail to contribute to

the framing of the turning head which would be demonstrably at odds with the existing pattern of development.

6. The proposal would replace an existing large outbuilding within the garden of No 6. However, this building is distinctly visible between dwellings, despite having a shallow pitched roof. Based on the evidence before me, the proposal would be larger and therefore, even in outline form, it is apparent that any new dwelling on the site would be highly visible. This would compound its incongruous positioning and ensure that any new dwelling would appear distinctly at odds with the prevailing pattern of development. Accordingly, the proposal would be significantly harmful to the character and appearance of the area.
7. The proposal would represent a windfall site in a built-up and sustainable location. It is also in outline form and therefore could most likely be arranged in a manner that would not give rise to overlooking or privacy concerns, would make adequate provision for the parking of vehicles, and would retain usable amenity space for future and existing occupants. All of these matters weigh in favour of the proposal, but due to its small scale, this weight is limited. However, due to the size and location of the appeal site, the provision of a new dwelling would compromise the well-considered layout found within the close, thereby creating a cramped form of development that would cause demonstrable harm. This is a matter of fundamental concern to which I attach significant weight, and as a consequence, it outweighs the benefits identified above.
8. Accordingly, I conclude that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore fail to comply with Policies SP2, SP3 and DE1 of the South Kesteven District Council Local Plan 2011 – 2036 (2020). Taken together, these policies seek amongst other things, good quality infill development.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons identified above, the appeal is dismissed.

Martin Chandler

INSPECTOR