
Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 7 September 2021

by John Gunn Dip TP, Dip DBE, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 September 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/W3710/W/21/3276960

74 Kingsbridge Road, Nuneaton CV10 0DB

- 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 Geoff Smith against the decision of Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 037125, dated 1 May 2020, was refused by notice dated 21 December 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as 'New dwelling in land adjacent to 74 Kingsbridge Road (Residential Garden)'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The Government published on 20 July 2021 a revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). Accordingly, and in light of the reference made to the previous iteration of the Framework within the submitted evidence, the parties have been provided with a further opportunity to make submissions in respect of the publication. In that context it is fair and necessary for me to have regard to it.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site lies in a residential area at a location close to where Kingsbridge Road and Shanklin Drive cross. The area is characterised by semi-detached and detached dwellings, set back a modest distance from the highway, with well defined 'building lines' to both roads, leading to a characteristic local consistency.
5. The new bungalow would be sited close to the footway with Shanklin Drive and would be prominent in the street scene given this, and the alignment of the road. It would be positioned well forward of No 55 Shanklin Drive resulting in a building that would be visually dominant within the streetscene, the harm of which would be exacerbated by the largely solid side elevations, which would be particularly prominent from Shanklin Drive. Moreover, the development of the appeal site with the proposed bungalow would significantly erode the open characteristics of the site that currently exist between the host property and No

55, which is a characteristic feature of the area and, in my view contributes to its ordered and moderate density character.

6. Accordingly, I conclude that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area, in conflict with Policy BE3 of the Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough Council Borough Plan 2011 - 2031 (adopted 2019) which, amongst other matters, seeks to promote high quality design that contributes to local distinctiveness and character by reflecting the positive attributes of the neighbouring area. It would also be contrary to the Sustainable Design and Construction SPD 2020 which requires, amongst other matters, for infill developments to follow the existing pattern of development line defined by the immediate adjoining property.

Other Matters

7. The appellant has drawn my attention to a bungalow that has been erected within the garden of 79 Kingsbridge Road. On my site visit I noted similarities with the appeal proposal, albeit that the scheme before me and that development differ in design. Moreover, I have not been provided with any evidence regarding the context in which the development was permitted, or its similarity to the circumstances here. It does not provide justification for development that would fail to add to the overall quality of the area in the immediate vicinity of the appeal site.
8. I also note that no objections have been raised by the highway authority, subject to appropriate conditions being imposed on any permission, and the Council have raised no objections with regards to the effect on living conditions of neighbouring residents. However, the absence of harm with regards to these matters does not outweigh the significant harm to the character and appearance of the area that I have identified above.

Conclusion

9. For the above reasons, having regard to the development plan as a whole and all other relevant material consideration, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

John Gunn

INSPECTOR

