

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 August 2022

by Steven Hartley BA (Hons) Dist.TP (Manc) DMS MRTPI MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8TH August 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/E2530/W/22/3297016

35 Church Street, Long Bennington NG23 5ES

- 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 Mrs V. Hampshire against the decision of South Kesteven District Council.
 - The application Ref: S21/1998, dated 7 October 2021, was refused by notice dated 4 February 2022.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a single storey dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The Church Street area is characterised by one and two storey, red brick dwellings of different sizes and types, with pantile roofs, and with front gardens of varying depths. The properties vary in age and design and are in linear form along Church Street, though there is more modern development, usually in the form of culs-de-sac leading from it.
4. The proposed detached, single storey dwelling would be sited to the rear of No. 35 Church Street and would be accessed along an existing single width track lying between No's 35 and 37 Church Street. To the rear and side of the appeal site, approvals have been granted relating to two separate applications for a total of 13 dwellings, though not using the access proposed for the appeal development. While these have not yet been constructed, I afford the approvals significant weight in the decision-making process.
5. The extant approvals are for detached dwellings in spacious plots. The existing properties, including those No'd 33 to 37 Church Street, also have spacious rear gardens facing those dwellings forming part of the extant approval so that the existing and planned development will provide an environment characterised by a relatively low-density and spacious pattern of development.

6. The appeal proposal would be sited between the rear of No. 35 Church Street and the approved dwelling No. 6 as shown on the site plan accompanying the appeal proposal. Owing to its position, I find that it would adversely affect the prevailing spacious arrangement around buildings within the immediate locality.
7. My attention has been brought to other developments in the area relating to back-land development, though I have insufficient details of the circumstances relating to them. In any event, I have determined the application based upon the circumstances surrounding the appeal proposal and the overall positive and distinctive characteristics of the area as identified above.
8. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposal would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the area when account is taken of the extant planning approvals. It would therefore be contrary to policy DE1 of the South Kesteven Local Plan 2020 which requires good design and policy SP3 which stresses the need for development to be appropriate in terms of scale, size and layout. It would also not accord with policies LB1 and LB2 of the Long Bennington Neighbourhood Plan 2016-26 which require development to take account of the impact upon the community and the quality of life of residents living in adjoining properties, or with section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2021 which stresses the need for good design.
9. I do not consider that chapter 5 relating to the provision of an adequate supply of houses to be relevant to the consideration of the main issue.

Conclusion

10. For the above reasons, I conclude that the development would not accord with the development plan for the area taken as a whole, and there are no material considerations that indicate the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, the appeal should be dismissed.

Steven Hartley

INSPECTOR