



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 March 2023

by K Williams MTCP (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20th July 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/Y2003/W/22/3308925

18 Manor Road, Bottesford DN16 3PA

- 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 Paul Evans against the decision of North Lincolnshire Council.
 - The application Ref PA/2021/1180, dated 22 June 2022, was refused by notice dated 9 September 2022.
 - The development proposed is described as an Outline Planning Application for Demolition of existing property and Erection of 5no. dwellings.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The proposal is for outline planning permission with all matters reserved. Indicative site layout plans were submitted with the application, including showing the access. In reaching my decision I have had regard to these.
3. I have used the address and description of development given on the planning application form. In Part E of the appeal form it is stated that the description of development has not changed but, nevertheless, a different wording has been entered. Neither of the main parties has provided written confirmation that a revised description of development has been agreed. Accordingly, I have used the one given on the original application.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

5. The appeal site is on the northern side of Manor Road. Similar to neighbouring plots on either side, it accommodates a large, detached, dwelling that is set well back from the carriageway with a generous front and rear garden. Consequently, although the density of development fluctuates in the wider area, with denser arrangements apparent further east along Manor Road and at the cul-de-sac development at Wayside Close, this particular part of the streetscene is distinctly characterised by spacious, low level, development set in a traditional arrangement. It therefore has its own recognisable rhythm and spatial pattern. There are also many trees in the area that contribute positively to the verdant, individual, character of this part of the street. This includes trees at the appeal site protected by a group Tree Preservation Order.

6. The proposal seeks outline permission for 5 dwellings following the demolition of No 18 Manor Road. To accommodate for protected trees, the indicative site layout plan shows that these could be positioned in a stepped arrangement. Two detached units could be placed on opposite sides of the repositioned central access road, with a pair of semi-detached properties and another detached unit sited behind them.
7. New units could be set back from the carriageway and built to a high standard of design. Nevertheless, their staggered arrangement is not a feature of this particular part of the streetscene. Moreover, while individual units would be sizeable, the majority of plots would be markedly smaller than those to the east and west. This is particularly so for the new dwellings to the rear of the site. As such, the individual layout of new units would fail to harmonise with adjacent plots in terms of size. Consequently, the proposal would fail to assimilate successfully with the spatial pattern of development in this part of the street.
8. In addition, while there would be open space retained to the front of the site, the proposal would add a significant amount of built development throughout it. Indeed, the amount of development would be considerably greater than at adjacent plots. Some of the new units would also be positioned close to one-another and site boundaries. Accordingly, not only would certain dwellings appear relatively cramped upon their plots in relation to their size, but the development as a whole would erode the site's open character and would appear uncharacteristically dense. This is so even though the scheme proposes a lower housing density than is required by the development plan. The above reinforces the proposal's failure to integrate well with the existing spatial pattern of development in the immediate area.
9. The site is in a highly accessible location and future residents would have access to services and facilities by means of transport other than private vehicles. Furthermore, it is appreciated that the scheme has evolved following discussions with the Council and would not cause harm to the health of trees of significant amenity value. Nonetheless, although plans are indicative at this stage, I am not persuaded that a scheme for this quantum of new units could be achieved at this site in an arrangement that would integrate appropriately with the spatial pattern of development in this particular part of the street.
10. For these reasons, the proposal would result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore conflict with policies DS1, H5 and H8 of the North Lincolnshire Local Plan (2003) (the Local Plan) and policies CS5 and CS7 of the North Lincolnshire Core Strategy (2011) (the Core Strategy). Amongst other things, these expect developments to be of a density that is in keeping with the character of the area and reflect or enhance its overall character, appearance and setting.

Planning Balance

11. From the evidence before me¹, the Council cannot demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing land (supply currently falling between 3.2 and 4.8 years). Consequently, paragraph 11 of the Framework is engaged. This states that planning permission should be granted unless any adverse impacts of

¹ Appeal Ref: APP/Y2003/W/21/3278257

doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits. This is a matter which I address below.

12. The Government is seeking to significantly boost the supply of housing. The principle of residential development at this accessible site would be acceptable. However, regardless of the extent of the Council's shortfall of housing land, the proposal for four net additional dwellings would make only a modest contribution to its housing stock. This is also true for associated economic benefits. In this context, I give modest weight to these social and economic benefits.
13. Noting that there were no statutory consultee objections, the proposal would be acceptable in terms of highway safety, ecology, flood risk and impacts upon living conditions. Nevertheless, the absence of harm is a neutral factor in the overall planning balance.
14. On the other hand, the scheme would harm the character and appearance of the area, particularly the spatial pattern of development in this part of the street. It would therefore fail to fulfil the environmental objective of sustainability within the Framework. This is a matter which attracts significant weight against the development.
15. The above factors lead me to conclude that the adverse impacts of the scheme would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits associated with the provision of four additional dwellings at the site. The proposal would therefore conflict with the development plan when read as a whole and there are no material considerations, including the advice of the Framework, which outweigh this conflict.

Conclusion

16. For the above reasons, and having regard to all other relevant matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

K Williams

INSPECTOR