



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 March 2021

by Paul Cooper MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 March 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/B3030/W/20/3264003

Land south of Sycamore Lane, Bleasby, Nottinghamshire NG14 7GJ

- 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 & Mrs Horsley against the decision of Newark & Sherwood District Council.
 - The application Ref 20/00582/OUT, dated 9 April 2020, was refused by notice dated 29 May 2020.
 - The development proposed is erection of new dwelling and associated works.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The planning application was made in outline form with access to be determined at that time. However, it appears from the evidence in front of me that siting has been dealt with at this stage, and I will take this into consideration in this appeal.

Main Issues

3. The main issue in this case is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is part of the garden area for No.6 Sycamore Close. The properties on the cul-de-sac are generally large, sat in generous plots. The immediate locality is residential in nature. Whilst appearance is not determined at this stage with the outline application, it is indicated that the dwelling would be two storeys. Access is to be determined at this stage and would be taken directly off Sycamore Lane
5. The Council has indicated that they can demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing land. This has not been disputed by the appellants. The Development Plan is not therefore absent, silent or out-of-date. Accordingly, the tilted balance set out in paragraph 11 of the Framework is not engaged. I have considered the appeal on this basis
6. The development plan sets out a delivery strategy for development and sets out a settlement hierarchy from the sub-regional centre of Newark down through larger service centres and principal villages. Bleasby falls in the 'other village' category at the bottom of the hierarchy and is assessed under policies SP3 and CP9 of the Amended Core Strategy (2019) (the ACS).

7. I find that the proposed dwelling would be at odds with the character and appearance of the area. The subdivision of one of the large plots and the addition of another dwelling in a smaller plot would be an incongruous addition to the cul-de-sac and look out of place when seen in the context of the locality and would significantly reduce the spacious qualities of the area and have a harmful effect upon its character and appearance.
8. In light of the above, I have formed the view that the amount of built form and site coverage, and the subdivision of the plot, would be out of keeping with the prevailing pattern of development in the locality. A dwelling in this location would erode the spacious feel to this immediate locality. This would be apparent when viewed from the public highway. As a result, I find that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area.
9. As a result, I find the proposal would be in conflict with Policies SP3 and CP9 of the ACS and policy DM5 of the Allocations and Development Management Development Plan Document , which, amongst other matters state that development should not have a detrimental impact on the character of the location and should reflect local distinctiveness.

Other Matters

10. I have noted the comments of the appellant regarding the sustainability of the site, but that does not overcome the harm that I have identified. The quality of the housing identified in the locality is not a positive for the proposal. The overall site is a comprehensive development of its time and has some appeal in terms of a character. The appellants comments regarding what could be constructed under permitted development is noted, however to develop a domestic dwelling is a different matter, in terms of the outlook and the way it could be designed in terms of permitted development restrictions, so I assign little weight to the argument.
11. I have taken into consideration the comments of local residents and have addressed the matters that were dealt with by the Council as appropriate.

Conclusion

12. Therefore, for the reasons given above, and taking into account all other matters, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Paul Cooper

INSPECTOR