



**Guildhall Gainsborough
Lincolnshire DN21 2NA
Tel: 01427 676676 Fax: 01427 675170**

This meeting will be recorded and published on the website

AGENDA

**Planning Committee
Wednesday 25 July 2012 at 6.30 pm
The Council Chamber, Guildhall, Gainsborough**

Members: Councillor Chris Underwood-Frost (Chairman)
Councillor Stuart Curtis (Vice-Chairman)

Councillors Owen Bierley, Alan Caine, David Cotton, Richard Doran,
Ian Fleetwood, Malcolm Leaning, Jessie Milne, Roger Patterson, Judy
Rainsforth

1. Apologies for absence.
2. Public Participation Period. Up to 15 minutes are allowed for public participation. Participants are restricted to 3 minutes each.
3. Minutes.
Meeting of the Planning Committee held on 27 June 2012, previously circulated.
4. Members' Declarations of Interest.

Members may make any declarations of interest at this point but may also make them at any time during the course of the meeting.
5. Update on Government/Local Changes in Planning Policy

Agendas, Reports and Minutes will be provided upon request in the following formats:

Large Clear Print: Braille: Audio Tape: Native Language

6. Planning Applications for Determination
Print herewith PL.05 12/13
Summary attached at Appendix A

PAPER A

7. To note the following determination of appeals:

i) Appeal by Mr J Dixon against West Lindsey District Council's refusal to grant planning permission for replacement dwelling design on extant permission, at Shaw Way, Nettleham,

Appeal dismissed – see copy letter attached as Appendix Bi

Officer's original recommendation to Approve, subject to conditions but was refused at committee (29 June 2011)

ii) Appeal by Mr T Schjerve against West Lindsey District Council's refusal to grant planning permission for the erection of four detached dwellings (high level Code Sustainable Homes) on land to rear of 15 Greetwell Lane, Nettleham, Lincoln LN2 2PN and a replacement dwelling for 15 Greetwell Lane

Appeal dismissed – see copy letter attached as Appendix Bii

Officer's original recommendation to Approve, subject to conditions but was refused at committee (16 November 2011)

iii) Appeal by Mr G Cole against West Lindsey District Council's refusal to grant planning permission for the severance of part of garden and erection of detached bungalow, on land adjacent to Hillside, Ferry Road, Southrey.

Appeal dismissed – see copy letter attached as Appendix Biii

Officer's original recommendation to refuse.

iv) Appeal by Mr C Henderson against West Lindsey District Council's refusal to grant planning permission for a two storey rear domestic extension, at 36 Lodge lane, Nettleham.

Appeal dismissed – see copy letter attached as Appendix Biv

Officer's original recommendation to refuse.

M Gill
Chief Executive
The Guildhall
Gainsborough

17 July 2012

1. **127782 - Planning application to carry out development without complying with conditions previously imposed - removal of conditions 14 and 22 and variation of conditions 3, 18 and 21 of planning application M05-P-0486
Caistor Hospital Site North Kelsey Road Caistor Market Rasen**

RECOMMENDED DECISION: That the decision to grant permission subject to the following conditions be delegated to the Director of Regeneration and Planning upon the completion and signing of a section 106 agreement which includes:-

- The securing of affordable housing either on or off the site.
- The securing of a financial contribution towards the provision of community facilities within the town of Caistor commensurate in scale to that reasonably required by the development.
- An obligation requiring the developer to offer the existing chapel building within the site to West Lindsey Council for a sum to be established by an independent qualified chartered surveyor, that obligation expiring after 12 months of the completion and signing of the section 106 agreement.

but that all of the obligations above do not collectively amount to more than the value of the provision of 11.33 affordable homes which is evidenced as being the maximum viable contribution that can be secured from the developer following an assessment of viability by the Council .

2. **128502 - Planning application for installation of wind turbine - 50 metres to hub and 77 metres to blade tip
Lodge Farm Kettlethorpe Lane Kettlethorpe Lincoln, Lincolnshire LN1 2LD**

RECOMMENDED DECISION - Grant Planning Permission subject to conditions.

3. **128536 - Planning application for installation of wind turbine - 50 metres to hub and 77 metres to blade tip**

Ferry Farm Ferry Lane Kettlethorpe Lincoln, Lincolnshire LN1 2LF

RECOMMENDED DECISION: Defer and delegate approval to the Director of Regeneration and Planning subject to the conditions below and completion of a legal agreement in relation to the use of the managers bungalow.

4. **128559 - Planning application for proposed siting of 1no. 36.4m high wind turbine
Grange Farm Station Road Torksey Lincoln, Lincolnshire LN1 2ES**

RECOMMENDED DECISION - The decision to grant planning permission, subject to conditions, be delegated to the Director of Regeneration and Planning, subject to the resolution of the issue relating to MOD safeguarding.

In the absence of a resolution within 3 months, the matter will be referred back to the next available Planning Committee.

- 5. 128608 - Planning application to install 2no. 50kw wind turbines and ancillary works
Waddingham Grange Farm Waddingham Lincolnshire**

RECOMMENDED DECISION - Grant permission subject to conditions.

- 6. 128607 - Planning application to install 2no. 50kw wind turbines and ancillary works - 35m height to tip of blade
Grayingham Grange Grange Lane Grayingham**

RECOMMENDED DECISION: The decision to grant permission subject to conditions be delegated to the Director of Regeneration and Planning upon the resolution of issues pertaining to archaeology and MoD safeguarding. In the event of these issues not being resolved within 3 months from the date of this Committee, the application be reported back to the next available Committee upon the expiration of the 3 month period.

- 7. 127704 - Application for variation of condition 2 of planning permission 124560 granted 04 June 2010- amended highways plan.
Willingham Park, North Willingham LN8 3RH**

RECOMMENDED DECISION: Defer and Delegate approval to the Director of Regeneration and Planning subject to the completion of a variation to the Section 106 agreement.

- 8. 128343 - Planning application for construction of one bungalow, detached garage and summer house
Land off Gainsborough Road Saxilby Lincoln**

RECOMMENDED DECISION: Grant permission subject to conditions.

- 9. 128747 - Planning Application for dry grain store and dry area.
Village Farm Marton Gainsborough DN21 5AP**

RECOMMENDED DECISION: Grant Planning Permission subject to conditions

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 March 2012

by Martin H Seddon BSc DipTP MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 22 May 2012

Appeal Ref: APP/2535/A/11/2162780

Land at Shaw Way, Nettleham, Lincolnshire, LN2 2XS

- 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 J Dixon against the decision of West Lindsey District Council.
 - The application Ref 127296, dated 4 May 2011, was refused by notice dated 1 July 2011.
 - The development proposed is replacement dwelling design on extant permission.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. Following the site visit the appellant submitted a drawing showing the proposed first floor layout. Without this, the precise degree of projection of the proposed gabled window at the north-east elevation could not be determined. The drawing does not significantly alter the proposal and the Council has not objected to its submission.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the street scene and Nettleham village.

Reasons

4. The proposed dwelling would occupy the last plot located in a prominent position at the end of the cul-de-sac of Shaw Way. Shaw Way serves modern 2 storey detached dwellings that are similar in age and style but with variations in size, detailed design and the use of materials. This existing development has an overall consistency in appearance.
 5. The proposed dwelling would be of a more contemporary design. It would have a 2 storey central structure with gables facing south-east and north-west. To the north-east the building would be fronted by a gabled projection comprising an integral garage and bedroom in the roof space. There would also be a single storey family room. The intention would be to construct the building on a phased basis.
-

6. In terms of design the National Planning Policy Framework indicates that decisions should not attempt to impose architectural styles or individual tastes and they should not stifle innovation, originality or initiative through unsubstantiated requirements to conform to certain development forms or styles. However, it adds that it is proper to seek to promote or reinforce local distinctiveness.
7. The Parish Council has produced a Village Design Statement which recognises that Nettleham has an eclectic mix of architectural styles, representing progressive developments in house design, construction materials and building technology. The appellant submits that the dwelling has been designed to be of its time and deliberately contemporary rather than following a set of design parameters and influences associated with 1990s suburban development.
8. Nevertheless, the proposed dwelling would not complement others in Shaw Way because of its form and appearance. It would appear out of character in the street scene because of the general uniformity in built context. It would fail to enhance the local distinctiveness of this part of the village, contrary to policy STRAT 1 of the West Lindsey Local Plan First Review and the National Planning Policy Framework. It would also not be satisfactory with regard to the nature of the local environment in terms of design and detailing, contrary to Local Plan policy RES 1.
9. All other matters raised have been taken into account. However, for the reasons given above the appeal is dismissed.

Martin H Seddon

INSPECTOR

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 May 2012

by E Norma Farish BA DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 2 July 2012

Appeal Ref: APP/N2535/A/12/2167776

15 Greetwell Lane, Nettleham, Lincoln LN2 2PN

- 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 T Schjerve against the decision of West Lindsey District Council.
 - The application Ref 127518 , dated 1 July 2011, was refused by notice dated 30 November 2011.
 - The development proposed is the erection of four detached dwellings (high level Code Sustainable Homes) on land to rear of 15 Greetwell Lane, Nettleham, Lincoln LN2 2PN and a replacement dwelling for 15 Greetwell Lane.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The principal issues in this case are the impact of the proposed development, firstly, on the locality and on the character, appearance and setting of the nearby Scheduled Monument, secondly, on the council's management of the supply and location of housing land, and thirdly, on the residential environment of neighbouring occupiers.

Reasons

3. Nettleham is a long established village lying approximately 1 mile north of the edge of the built-up area of Lincoln. No.15 Greetwell Lane is one of a ribbon of detached and semi-detached dwellings on the east side of Greetwell Lane running southwards from the village centre into open countryside. Some of these houses, including No.15, have long back gardens which extend eastwards to the boundary of a Scheduled Ancient Monument (SAM), which is also the boundary of the Nettleham Conservation Area. The more easterly part of the appeal site, just over half of the length, is a double width plot which extends northward behind the rear garden to the adjoining house, No.11 Greetwell Lane.
 4. Three previous schemes for housing development on this site have been refused planning permission and subsequent appeals dismissed; the current proposal, which has been the subject of lengthy discussions with the council in an attempt
-

to address the shortcomings of the previous scheme (Appeal Ref. APP/N2535/A/08/2088944 dated 25 February 2009), is for the demolition of No.15 and its replacement by a new dwelling and a curving side drive leading to four further detached houses behind, all five being of contemporary style and all of high standards of sustainable design.

5. The whole of the appeal site is within the defined village development limits. However, this and other gardens behind this line of houses are largely open and clear and together with the land to the east they form an open green wedge between the countryside to the south and the heart of the village to the north. This openness is important to the character of the village and is significant to the setting of the SAM.
6. The proposed houses have been designed, in both roof profile and levels, to minimise their visibility in more distant views, and this would be assisted by the retention of an existing tree belt along the eastern boundary and further landscape planting. However, to the south side of the site is a horse paddock and to the north the land falls towards the centre of the village and so these two storey buildings would still be conspicuous from both directions, and from much of the SAM, particularly in winter when deciduous trees on the boundary lost their leaves. The houses would thus appear intrusive in this open area and impinge on an important view into the village, so damaging the contribution which this incursion of countryside makes to the character of the locality.
7. The SAM, Bishop's Manor, includes the remains of a medieval bishop's palace, and I am advised that funding has been achieved to open the site to the public as a tourism asset. Part of the appeal site lies within the Bishop's Manor itself though not included in the SAM. The proposed development scheme was amended to locate the two more easterly houses, on plots 1 and 2, away from the most sensitive archaeological remains. It was suggested that the easterly elevations of those two buildings be in timber to mitigate their impact on the setting of the SAM, but as proposed they would be in light-coloured render, which would make them more conspicuous. In any event, the houses would be quite close to and visible from various parts of the SAM, especially the blank, predominantly brick, north elevation of the building on plot 1, and would form part of the setting of the SAM and of the conservation area which includes it. To my mind the size, massing and profile of the proposed development would neither enhance nor maintain the character and appearance of the conservation area and would be incongruous and detrimental to the setting of the SAM, contrary to the aims of saved policies STRAT 1(vi) and (vii) and STRAT 6(iv), (v) and (vii) of the West Lindsey Local Plan First Review and of the National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012) (NPPF).
8. Turning to my second issue, saved local plan policy STRAT 6 requires that all proposals for windfall housing development in primary rural settlements like Nettleham must be on previously developed land, and saved local plan policy STRAT 9 states that no site will be released for housing development if to do so would be premature and adversely affect the council's management of the housing land supply. The District currently has a deliverable housing land supply which is above the minimum cited in the NPPF. The housing land supply target is a minimum rather than a maximum and a net increase of four dwelling units in a primary rural settlement would not materially affect the council's current management of the housing supply. However, most of the appeal site,

being garden land, does not fall within the definition of previously developed land; the District has no housing land deficit at present and the development proposed would cause harm to the local area, and so the appeal scheme would be damaging to the objectives of both STRAT 6 and paragraph 53 of the NPPF.

9. Finally, care has been taken to create an attractive residential environment with its own sense of place, to maximise privacy within the appeal scheme, and to avoid intrusion on the privacy of neighbouring residential premises. Even so, the first floor balcony of plot 4 would be only 1.542m from the boundary with the rear garden of No.11 Greetwell Lane and, notwithstanding the presence of a few garden trees close to the boundary, would allow virtually unobstructed overlooking of that garden. Moreover, in such close proximity the new house would dominate and have an overbearing impact on No.11 and its garden. Landscape planting is indicated to the west of plot 4, but to enable access to the side door there would be insufficient space to provide a robust screen of vegetation. In addition, the shared driveway would bring vehicular noise and activity into an area which currently is traffic-free and tranquil. The driveway would pass barely 4m from the boundary of No.11 and the parking and manoeuvring area outside the garage of plot 4 would adjoin the garden to No.11 whence noise and general activity on the drive and forecourt would be unavoidably audible.
10. To the north of the appeal site is the larger part of the long back garden to No.9 Greetwell Lane. The houses proposed on plots 1 and 4 would be 1.3m or less from the south boundary of that garden, and on slightly higher land, and whilst they would have no windows facing north, they would heavily overshadow that part of the garden. Their long, almost blank rear walls, approximately 18m and 14.5m in length respectively, would have an unattractive and overbearing impact on that garden and, to a lesser extent, the garden to No.7 beyond, as would the massing of plot 4 on the rear conservatory of No.9. Again, the short distance from the northern boundary would not permit the provision of effective screen planting, the more so since plot 1 would have a back door in the north elevation. Furthermore, the construction of an extensive cellar under plot 1 might well threaten the health of the young trees nearby within that neighbouring garden.
11. With regard to No.17 Greetwell Lane, south of the appeal site, the occupier has extended her home to the side and rearwards in order to live entirely on the ground floor for health reasons, and has habitable room windows facing north and east. The three bedroom windows and the balcony to plot 3 would all face southwards across an agricultural access towards the horse paddock which is currently attached to No.17. Although the balcony to plot 3 would be just 1m from the south boundary of the appeal site and, together with the upstairs windows, would permit views, albeit oblique, towards the rear of No.17, they would be between 18m and 22m away from the nearest point of the garden of No.17 and more than 30m from the nearest bedroom window. The house and balcony on plot 3 would intrude on the open outlook currently enjoyed from No.17 but would not be so close to the curtilage of that property as to result in a material loss of privacy. The new driveway, however, would be a mere 7m or so from the side elevation and windows of No.17. Since the drive would be the sole means of access for both vehicles and pedestrians to the four dwellings at the rear and having regard to its horizontal alignment, it is likely that comings

and goings along it, including noise, exhaust fumes and lights from traffic, would cause disturbance and potential loss of privacy to the occupier of No.17, to the detriment of her living environment and well-being.

12. The appeal scheme would thus be seriously harmful to the residential enjoyment of all of these neighbouring properties and conflict with the provisions of saved local plan policies RES 1, STRAT 1(vi) and STRAT 6(iii), which are broadly consistent with the NPPF.
13. The proposed development is designed to high standards of sustainability which the appellant submits would be a "first" for West Lindsey and help set enhanced standards for the delivery of such housing throughout the District. This carries a great deal of weight. The NPPF enshrines a presumption in favour of sustainable development, which should be permitted unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole. I have taken account of all other matters raised in the representations before me, including the likely effects on traffic safety and congestion, drainage, and wildlife; for the reasons given above I consider that the benefits of the high standards of sustainable design are significantly and demonstrably outweighed by other issues, and I have come to the conclusion that the appeal should be dismissed.

E Norma Farish

INSPECTOR



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 June 2012

by John Murray LLB, Dip.Plan.Env, DMS, Solicitor

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 10 July 2012

Appeal Ref: APP/N2535/A/12/2171499

Land adjacent to "Hillside", Ferry Road, Southrey, Lincolnshire, LN3 5TD

- 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 Grahame Cole against the decision of West Lindsey District Council.
- The application Ref 127827, dated 29 September 2011, was refused by notice dated 23 November 2011.
- The development proposed is the severance of part of the garden and the erection of one detached bungalow.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural matters

2. The proposal was submitted in outline with all matters reserved for later consideration except access. When assessing the likely impact of the scheme I have had regard to the illustrative drawing No. SP1.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is whether the proposal is acceptable having regard to policies aimed at promoting sustainable development and safeguarding character and appearance and having regard to the supply of housing land.

Reasons

4. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) contains a presumption in favour of sustainable development¹ and states that the social dimension of sustainable development includes providing the "supply of housing required to meet the needs of the present and future generations" and "creating a high quality built environment, with accessible local services..."² The economic dimension of sustainable development also requires that "sufficient land of the right type is available in the right places and at the right time to support growth..."³.
5. Consistent with the NPPF, the West Lindsey District Local Plan (First Review) 2006 (LP) establishes a hierarchy of settlements and locations and seeks to direct housing development to the most sustainable locations with good access to services, facilities and employment. Saved LP Policy STRAT 3 classifies

¹ NPPF paragraph 14.

² Ibid paragraph 7.

³ Ibid paragraph 7.

Southrey as a Small Rural Settlement. Although I noted a church, a public house and a village hall, where notices were displayed for a mobile library scheme, mini – market and various clubs, Southrey’s services and facilities are limited and it is clearly not one of the district’s more sustainable locations. In any event, saved Policy STRAT 8 provides that residential development will not be permitted in a Small Rural Settlement, save where specified exceptions apply. The only potentially relevant exception is that concerning an individual new dwelling, where this will, at the very least, not harm the character of the settlement and where it will meet a defined local need.

6. Dealing first with the question of local need, Policy STRAT 8 states that this will exist where any 1 of 4 criteria is met. At face value, the local need requirement of the policy is satisfied, because the appellant says he lived in the village for at least 3 years out of the last 5, in accordance with criterion aa. However, the Council says that the appellant owns 2 other properties in the village and a neighbour says that he lives in Spain. The appellant denies the relevance, but not the truth of these statements. I have not been provided with a copy of the reasoned justification for Policy STRAT 8, which might assist with the definition of ‘local need’ but, in the absence of any indication that the proposed dwelling would accommodate another member of the appellant’s household with a local connection, it is difficult to see how it would actually meet a local need in the circumstances described. This must be a material consideration, notwithstanding compliance with the letter of this part of saved Policy STRAT 8.
7. In any event, the proposal could only comply fully with Policy STRAT 8 if it would not harm the character of the settlement and saved Policies STRAT 1 and RES 1 also seek to protect local character and appearance. In this respect, whilst layout and siting are reserved, it is clear that the proposed new dwelling would conflict with the building line established on this part of Ferry Road. For some distance to the north, the dwellings are set well back from the road along a consistent building line, with generous front gardens. This creates a spacious ambience, which compliments the wider, rural setting of open fields to the east and this is a distinctive feature of the locality.
8. Whilst it is not designated in the LP as an Important Open Space, or an Importance Frontage, the appeal site is part of the established and spacious street scene and it occupies a prominent position at the junction of Ferry Road and Thorpe Road. In this location, and notwithstanding the overall size of the appeal site and the more varied building line to the south, the proposed dwelling would appear intrusive in the street scene and would detract from the spacious character of the area. In this respect, regardless of the debate over the issue of local need, the appeal scheme would therefore conflict with saved LP Policies STRAT 1, STRAT 8 and RES 1. Protecting and enhancing the built environment is part of the environmental dimension of sustainable development⁴, as well as the social dimension already referred to and the Government attaches great importance to the design of the built environment and the promotion or reinforcement of local distinctiveness⁵.
9. The Council’s first reason for refusal refers to an over supply of housing. The NPPF states that local planning authorities should ensure that there is a specific, deliverable 5 year supply of housing against their requirements with

⁴ NPPF paragraph 7.

⁵ Ibid paragraphs 56 – 58, 60 and 64.

an additional 5% buffer. The Council has clearly met this requirement, as the Central Lincolnshire Housing Market Area Supply Assessment 2012 indicates that West Lindsey has a 6.6 year housing supply. The 5 year plus 5% threshold is a minimum requirement and therefore the existence of a 6.6 year supply is not a reason in itself for rejecting any housing proposal. However, given that there is a healthy supply, there is no pressing need to allow housing developments in Small Rural Settlements where the policy requirements are not fully met. Cumulatively, even single dwelling schemes in such locations could undermine the policy objective of directing development to more sustainable locations. This site does not even have the advantage of being previously developed land; it is merely "Other Greenfield Land" and therefore has the lowest priority under saved LP Policy STRAT 9.

10. For the reasons given, I conclude on the main issue that the proposal is not acceptable having regard to policies aimed at promoting sustainable development and safeguarding character and appearance and having regard to the supply of housing land. On the basis of that conclusion and taking account of all other matters raised, I am satisfied that the appeal should be dismissed.

J A Murray

INSPECTOR

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 July 2012

by E Norma Farish BA DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 13 July 2012

Appeal Ref: APP/N2535/D/12/2175731

Redbourne, 36 Lodge Lane, Nettleham, Lincoln LN2 2RS

- 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 C Henderson against the decision of West Lindsey District Council.
 - The application Ref 128275 was refused by notice dated 27 April 2012.
 - The development proposed is a two-storey rear domestic extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

3. The principal issues in this case are the impact of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the streetscene, and on the residential amenities of the occupiers of the adjoining dwelling.

Reasons

4. The appeal site lies on the west side of Lodge Lane, the main route through Nettleham village, in a prominent position on the approach to the village from the south. It comprises a traditional two-storey cottage on a large plot, and is set close to the footway and far forward of the line of true bungalows to the north. The principal aspect is to the south with only one small window in the flank elevation facing the road. The building is small and dilapidated with low ceilings, and very restricted headroom on part of the upper floor, and the external walls are painted red. The appellant wishes to remove two small, unsightly extensions and various other structures on the property, strip the external walls of the house back to the original stone and brick, and add on the west side a two-storey extension in brick and stone to produce, with internal alterations, a five-bedroom dwelling.
 5. The National Planning Policy Framework of March 2012 (NPPF) enshrines a general presumption in favour of sustainable development, which must be applied by local planning authorities in determining development proposals though not without having regard to relevant development plan policies and other considerations. Saved policy STRAT1 of the West Lindsey Local Plan First
-

Review 2006 requires that development be satisfactory with regard to its impact on neighbouring and other land and on historic assets. Saved policy R11 says that extensions to dwellings should be well designed in relation to the dwelling to be extended and subordinate to it so that they resemble the existing building in design and materials and do not dominate it, and that they do not damage the amenity of neighbours. These development plan policies are broadly in accord with Part 7 of the NPPF, which states in paragraph 61 that planning decisions should address "the integration of new development into the natural, built and historic environment".

6. The proposed extension would comprise a two-storey block somewhat larger in floorspace than the existing cottage and connected to it by a two-storey glass and stone link housing the staircase and a new main entrance. The long axis of the extension would run north-south and be at least 50% longer than the north-south dimension of the present building. The proposed extension would, moreover, be mostly forward of the front main walls of the single storey bungalows to either side. In consequence, it would be clearly visible from all directions, and since its roof would be no lower than that of the cottage and, unlike the cottage, would not be hip-ended, it would dominate the cottage when viewed in conjunction with it. Additionally, the north gable wall of the extension would be only 2.329m from the adjoining dwelling, No.34 Lodge Lane, which has a hipped roof with a shallow pitch, and such proximity would produce a visually uncomfortable relationship between the two buildings. The appeal scheme, though evidently carefully thought out functionally and in terms of external materials, would thus be damaging to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and harmful to the streetscene.
7. The existing cottage, though neither listed nor within or adjacent to the Nettleham Conservation Area, is a surviving remnant of old Nettleham and makes a positive contribution to the historic building stock of the village. The removal of the present front door from its typical position in the centre of the principal elevation and the subordination of the old building to a dominant new one would destroy much of the original character of this heritage asset, to the detriment of the character of the village as a whole. The development proposed would, therefore, conflict with and be detrimental to the aims of local plan policies STRAT1 and R11.
8. On my second issue, the appellant states that the proposed development was designed with due consideration for the neighbouring property, No.34. Certainly the new building would not intrude on the privacy of the rear amenity area of that adjoining bungalow, or that of No.38 Lodge Lane to the south. The dormer windows to be inserted in the north slope of the cottage roof would directly overlook the front garden of No.34 at a distance of barely 2m, but that garden is already open to public view. One window is to a shower room and could be obscure glazed; the other would be at least 10m from the front windows of No.34 and at such an oblique angle that there would be no material loss of privacy for the occupiers of that bungalow.
9. However, the cottage enlarged as proposed would extend for the full length of the front garden to No.34 and on its south side. The present building will already cut out some sunlight to that garden, but the extension would cut out much more and, because of its length and height, would have an overbearing impact when viewed from No.34 and so make that dwelling materially less

pleasant to live in. The renovation of the existing cottage would undoubtedly improve its appearance in the outlook from No.34, but that benefit would not outweigh the detriment to the residential environment of the occupiers of that neighbouring property which the extension would cause. For this reason also the development proposed would fail to meet the objectives of local plan policy R11.

10. The appellant relies on a scheme for a substantial two-storey domestic extension recently granted planning permission by the council elsewhere in the District, Ref. 128262, which he argues is indicative of a willingness by the council to interpret its policies more flexibly than it has in his case. However, having looked at that site also, I consider the two cases to be rather different, the existing dwelling on the other site being much larger and the attractively designed extension being lower and significantly smaller than the host building and clearly subordinate to it. I do not consider, therefore, that the two cases are comparable.
11. I note the appellant's frustration that the council officers declined to discuss with him the appeal application before it was determined. I appreciate that the appellant did not consult with them, and so paid no consultation fee, prior to submitting the application, but there is no legal obligation to do so, though advance consultation can often avoid wasted time and money and is encouraged by the NPPF (paragraphs 188 and 189). As a corollary, however, refusal to negotiate improvements when the application is live wastes the opportunity to achieve investment in the best possible development. Paragraph 187 of the NPPF says that local planning authorities should look for solutions and work proactively with applicants to secure developments that improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area. That said, I have to deal with the proposals before me and the council's handling of the application does not affect the merits of the case.
12. I have given careful consideration to all other points raised in the representations received including the expression of no objection from the present occupier of No.34 Lodge Lane but for the reasons given above the appeal fails.

E Norma Farish

INSPECTOR