
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 March 2022

by Benjamin Clarke BA (Hons.) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30th March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/D0515/W/21/3285114

Land between 16 and 18 Perry Road, Leverington PE13 5AB

- 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 Darren Boyle against the decision of Fenland District Council.
 - The application Ref F/YR21/0316/F, dated 1 February 2021, was refused by notice dated 19 May 2021.
 - The development proposed is an infill two-storey, three-bed dwelling on land between No.16 & 18 Perry Road, Leverington, Wisbech, Cambs PE13 5AB.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issue relevant to this appeal is the effect of the development upon the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site consists of an area to the side of the existing dwelling. The character of the appeal site's vicinity can be defined by the presence of similarly designed semi-detached houses. Owing to this character, views of rear gardens and trees are possible. This ensures that the settlement harmonises with its rural surroundings. Although some of the surrounding dwellings are constructed to different designs, they reflect the prevailing character by reason of the presence of space surrounding them.
4. In contrast to the prevailing character, the proposed development would be a detached dwelling. This would conflict with the relatively uniform pattern of development within the vicinity.
5. In addition, owing to the different footprint of the proposed dwelling relative to the existing adjacent semi-detached houses, the proposed development would have a differing height to many of the nearby houses. Furthermore, the proposed development would also feature a differing design in terms of items such as the fenestration and porch detailing. Given that the proposed dwelling would be located in a ribbon form of dwellings, these differences would be readily apparent.
6. Given the relative uniformity of house types, a consistent feature of the surrounding area is the presence of similarly sized gaps between houses. On account of the proposed development in filling such a gap, the appeal scheme

- would have an adverse effect on the defining characteristic of openness. In consequence, the proposed development would appear incongruous.
7. Whilst the siting of houses within the surrounding areas are reflective of the road layout, a notable characteristic is the presence of open areas to the sides of buildings, which would be reduced by the proposed dwelling.
 8. This design is also a concern given that the appeal site is prominently located owing to its proximity to a roundabout and the junction between Perry Road and Walton Road. Furthermore, the proposed development would be visible from several of the nearby houses. Therefore, the appeal scheme has the potential to be experienced by a great number of people and, in result, would appear to be a strident addition to the vicinity.
 9. Although the proposed development would be located within a residential area there is a strong unifying character between differing sites. The proposed development would conflict with this and would therefore lead to harm to the character of the surrounding area.
 10. I understand that the settlement has been identified as being allocated as a location where future residential developments might take place. Whilst the appeal scheme would result in the provision of an additional dwelling, the development plan is clear that any such new residential development should also comply with other relevant planning policies.
 11. In considering this appeal, I have been directed towards planning policies that seek to maintain the character and appearance of appeal site surroundings and ensure that new developments are of a good standard of design. For the preceding reasons, I do not believe that this has been achieved in this instance.
 12. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would have an adverse effect upon the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The development, in this regard, would conflict with the requirements of Policy LP16 of the Fenland Local Plan (2014) and Policy DM3 of the Delivering and Protecting High Quality Environments in Fenland Supplementary Planning Document (2014). Amongst other matters, these seek to ensure that developments make a positive contribution to local distinctiveness; and ensure that the local built environment and settlement pattern inform the proposed development.

Other Matters

13. I note that in devising the appeal proposal, the appellant was endeavouring to overcome the reasons arising from a previous refusal of planning permission. Although a matter of note, this does not overcome my conclusions in respect of the main issue.

Conclusion

14. The proposed development would have an adverse effect upon the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The scheme would therefore conflict with the development plan taken as a whole. There are no material considerations, including the National Planning Policy Framework, that indicate the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development

plan. Therefore, for the preceding reasons, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Benjamin Clarke

INSPECTOR