



**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 6 February 2013 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, Giles McNeill, 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 9 January 2013, 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.12 12/13  
Summary attached at Appendix A **PAPER A**

7. Objection to Tree Preservation Order Caistor No2 2012 **PAPER B**

8. To note the following determination of appeals:

- i) Appeal by Mr J Lee against West Lindsey District Council's refusal to grant planning permission for the construction of two single-storey dwellings with detached garage, and adaptation of existing two-bedroom bungalow, to enable vehicular access, including new single-storey detached garage at 15 Lincoln Road, Dunholme.

**Appeal dismissed** – see copy letter attached as Appendix Bi

Officer's original recommendation to refuse.

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

**Appeal Allowed** – see copy letter attached as Appendix Bii

Officer's original recommendation to grant.

- iii) Appeal by Mrs K Hippey against West Lindsey District Council's refusal to grant planning permission for a dwelling on Land at rear of 63 Silver Street, Bardney.

**Appeal Allowed** – see copy letter attached as Appendix Biii

Officer's original recommendation to refuse.

M Gill  
Chief Executive  
The Guildhall  
Gainsborough

29 January 2013

**Item 1 - Planning Application No: 128623**

**PROPOSAL:** Planning application for new office accommodation block and upgrade to existing access

**LOCATION:** Land off Main Street, Torksey, LN1 2EE

**RECOMMENDED DECISION:** Grant with Conditions

**Item 2 - Planning Application No: 129187**

**PROPOSAL:** Planning application for erection of 6no. retail units; units 1 and 2 for Class A1 and units RU3-RU6 for use classes A1, A3 and A5-together with associated access, car parking and landscaping.

**LOCATION:** Junction of Carr Lane and Lea Road Gainsborough Lincolnshire

**RECOMMENDED DECISION:** Grant permission subject to conditions and the completion and signing of an agreement under section 106 of the amended Town & Country Planning Act 1990 to secure the advertising of employment opportunities associated with the development to the local area.

**Item 3 - Planning Application No: 128652**

**PROPOSAL:** Planning application for change of use of roof space above garage and store into accommodation for staff members of the John Kinch Group.

**LOCATION:** The Elms, Residential Park, Torksey Lock, Torksey, Lincoln, LN1 2EH

**RECOMMENDED DECISION:** Grant permission

---

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 December 2012

**by David Kaiserman BA DipTP MRTPI**

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

**Decision date: 2 January 2013**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/N2535/A/12/2180787**  
**15 Lincoln Road, Dunholme LN2 3QU**

- 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 Lee against the decision of West Lindsey District Council.
  - The application Ref 127810, dated 25 September 2011, was refused by notice dated 3 February 2012.
  - The development proposed is the construction of two single-storey dwellings with detached garage, and adaptation of existing two-bedroom bungalow, to enable vehicular access, including new single-storey detached garage.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## Procedural Matter

2. In his final comments on the appeal, the appellant refers to proposed amendments to the scheme, principally involving the orientation and detailed design of plot no.15b. The amendments are shown on drawing ref: JL/2008/001D, dated 6 November 2012. The Council based their decision on drawing ref: JL/2008/001C, dated 29 November 2011. While I recognise that the revision is intended to be a constructive response to the second reason for refusal, I consider it inappropriate to take it into account for the purposes of the appeal, since the changes are of a scale which suggests to me that they ought properly to be the subject of the normal processes of consultation and formal assessment by the Council.

## Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposal (a) on policies designed to manage the supply and release of new housing land within the District; and (b) on the living conditions of the occupiers of no 11 Oak Avenue.

## Reasons

4. The appeal site constitutes the major part of a substantial rear garden attached to a bungalow in the village of Dunholme. The proposal involves the removal of the bungalow's integral garage and sun-room so as to permit the construction of a new driveway between the property and no 13 Lincoln Road. This would
-

---

enable access to a small garage block intended to serve the two new bungalows, which would sit in the south-east corner of the site, surrounded by other residential plots on the three remaining sides. No 15 would retain a much smaller garden area at the rear.

5. As far as the first issue is concerned, I accept that the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) does not carry forward the guidance contained in the now-withdrawn *Planning Policy Statement 3: Housing*, which included private gardens within the definition of "previously-developed land". Since the NPPF continues to encourage the re-use of such "brownfield" sites, I therefore see no reason to disagree with the Council's conclusion that the appeal site would be of a low priority for housing land release in terms of "saved" Local Plan policy STRAT9. In addition, the appellant does not challenge the Council's assertion that the District as a whole does not at present have a shortfall of suitable housing land.
6. To set against this, however, I note that the Council accept that the appeal site is a sustainable one, given the range of services available in Dunholme. It is also the case that the wider strategic hierarchy for the District as a whole<sup>1</sup> contains five levels, and that "Primary Rural Settlements" such as Dunholme occupy the second highest. This locational factor is one to which the NPPF attaches considerable weight.
7. Policy STRAT6: *Windfall and Infill Development in Primary Rural Settlements*, which also informed the Council's decision to refuse planning permission, generally applies only to proposals involving 5-10 dwellings, which suggests that anything less than this would be treated as *de minimis* for policy purposes. (This is relevant because one of the eight criteria it contains, all of which are required to be satisfied, is that the land being considered for development must have been previously developed). For this reason, I am satisfied that policy STRAT6 is of little direct relevance to the appeal.
8. Given the small scale of the scheme, I consider it to constitute a modest infill which would have no material impact on the Council's ability to manage the release of housing land within the District.
9. Turning to the second issue, the dwelling referenced 15b on the plans would have a extremely intimate relationship with no 11 Oak Avenue, a bungalow with a substantial extension which brings it to within 4m of the side gable of the proposed dwelling. The boundary between the two properties is made up of a close-boarded timber fence topped with an open trellis, and supplemented by planting. This would prevent any significant overlooking; but the new building, 5.8m to its ridge, would be an unneighbourly feature which would result in an oppressive outlook both from facing windows (above the fence-line) and from the rather modest garden of no 11. Some loss of afternoon sun would also be experienced. I have noted that, while offering a revised design in order to address these criticisms, the appellant says nothing to suggest he rejects them.

---

<sup>1</sup> set out in policy STRAT3, submitted with the appeal papers

- 
10. In my view, the proposals would have an unacceptable impact on the living conditions of the occupiers of 11 Oak Avenue, resulting in conflict with Local Plan policy RES1(v).
  11. Overall, while I do not support the Council's principled case against the scheme, I agree with their objections to it in terms of its impact on the adjoining occupiers, and it is this factor to which I have concluded the greater weight should be given. I have therefore decided to dismiss the appeal.

*David Kaiserman*

INSPECTOR



---

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 December 2012

**by Simon Berkeley BA MA MRTPI**

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

**Decision date: 2 January 2013**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/N2535/D/12/2186356**

**Redbourne, 36 Lodge Lane, Nettleham, Lincolnshire 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 Chris Henderson against the decision of West Lindsey District Council.
  - The application reference 128989, was refused by notice dated 8 October 2012.
  - The development proposed is a two storey rear domestic extension.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two storey rear domestic extension at Redbourne, 36 Lodge Lane, Nettleham, Lincolnshire LN2 2RS, in accordance with the terms of the application, reference 128989, subject to the following conditions.
  - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
  - 2) No development shall take place until samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
  - 3) The doorway in the principal southern elevation of the existing property, shown on drawing number 0018/03, shall be retained as a doorway with an opening door.
  - 4) Except as otherwise required by this decision and the conditions above, the development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 0018/02; 0018/03; 0018/04 Revision B; and 0018/05 Revision B.

## Reasons

2. Redbourne is a detached house of some vintage. It is close to the built edge of Nettleham and is set at right angles to Lodge Lane, forward of the bungalows either side of it. The proposed development includes a partly two storey, partly single storey extension linked to the existing property by a two storey, flat roofed element glazed to both elevations. The scheme also involves removing the red paint covering the external walls of the existing house to reveal the brick and stone beneath. The effect of the development on the character and appearance of the existing house and surrounding area is the main issue.

3. This appeal follows the dismissal of an appeal (reference APP/N2535/D/12/2186356) in July 2012 for a similar proposal. The main differences are that the extension in the earlier application was proposed to be two storeys in height over its entire length, and the link component included a pitched roof and one stone elevation.
4. The extension now proposed, combined with the two storey link element, would be of some size and quite large in relation to the current house. However, a considerable portion of it would be single storey in height. In addition, the link building's roof would be set around the height of the eaves of the existing property. In combination, this amounts to a significant reduction in the volume and mass of the development compared to the earlier appeal proposal. Moreover, the transparency of the link element's two glazed elevations would lend it a 'lightweight' appearance, which would lessen its perceived mass. Consequently, in my view, the development overall would appear sufficiently restrained in scale and bulk so as to avoid dominating the present house.
5. Against the background of the generally linear row of bungalows along this side of Lodge Lane, the existing house is prominent in the street scene. The proposed development would also be closer to the lane than the bungalows, and consequently would be visible from the footpath along it. However, given my view that it would not dominate the present building, I see no reason why this in itself should be a problem. The existing house is already very different from the bungalows in terms of mass, appearance and prominence. The degree of change that the appeal development would bring about in these respects would not be excessive and would not detract from the surrounding environment.
6. It is proposed to remove the front door of the present property and block the opening with brick. My colleague in the previous appeal considered that this would erode the original character of the building. I have been given no reason to differ. Indeed, introducing brick walling below the arch feature demarking the doorway would look awkward, and would detract from the scheme's attempts to reveal the building's original walls and detailing. In addition to having a poor appearance, it would also diminish the legibility of the original building, and reduce its primacy in the composition of the resultant property.
7. However, these problems would be avoided and the character of the original building would not be harmed if the existing doorway were to be retained along with an opening door within it. A condition requiring this would not be unreasonable and would meet the tests in Circular 11/95: *The Use of Conditions in Planning Permissions* (Circular 11/95). Retaining the opening need not involve altering the proposed internal configuration, and the appellant confirms that he has no objections to the use of a condition in this regard. I have imposed an appropriate condition accordingly.
8. The extension's northern gable elevation would be two storeys in height and would be 2.329 metres from the neighbouring bungalow, being 34 Lodge Lane. The juxtaposition between the two would be similar to that in the previous appeal, which my colleague considered visually uncomfortable. However, my colleague's overall view that the previous scheme would be visually damaging was not reached on the basis of this element alone. It is the combination of this factor in addition to others which led to the conclusion that visual harm would be caused.



9. As then, the proximity, height and gabled design of the northern end elevation would be different to the shallow pitched, hipped roof of the adjacent bungalow. That being said, the alterations to the link element now proposed change the context of the relationship between the two buildings. In my view, the flat roof form and glazed elevation would both help to reduce the apparent size and bulk of the additions. As a consequence, notwithstanding their proximity and different designs, the relationship between the gable end and number 34 would be less uneasy than in the earlier appeal, and would not be a significantly detracting feature of the street scene. To my mind, although the visual effect of this element of the scheme would not be ideal, this factor alone would not cause material harm which would warrant rejecting it.
10. Overall, I conclude that with the imposition of a condition requiring the retention of the existing property's principal doorway with an opening door, the proposed development would not result in material harm to the character and appearance of the existing house and the surrounding area. As such, it would not conflict with Policy STRAT 1 of the West Lindsey Local Plan First Review 2006 (Local Plan). This policy seeks to ensure that developments protect the environment and safeguard and improve the quality of life of residents, by being satisfactory in terms of design and external appearance, among other things.
11. Local Plan Policy RES 11 allows two storey extensions to dwellings within settlements provided that they are well designed in relation to the size, shape and materials of the building to be extended, and are subordinate to the existing property. I acknowledge that the development could not be fairly described as 'subordinate' to the existing house, and as such would not strictly meet the precise wording of Policy RES 11. Nonetheless, paragraph 1.76 of the Local Plan explains that the aim of the policy in relation to scale is to ensure that extensions are not excessive in size so as to dominate the original dwelling. Given this, my view on this point and as no material harm would be caused, the scheme would accord with the underlying aim of Policy RES 11, and allowing it would not undermine the general policy objective. Nor would it conflict with the broad thrust of the National Planning Policy Framework in relation to design.
12. The Council's decision also refers to the Nettleham Village Design Statement, although it does not point to any specific part of that document. The Village Design Statement is not prescriptive in relation to the scale of additions, and I consider that the scheme would not conflict with the broad principles of its design guidance.

### **Other matters**

13. As in the previous appeal, the proposed development would result in a property which extends the full depth of the front garden at number 34. However, the lower height of the flat roof over the link element and the two glazed elevations proposed are significant factors. Both of these revisions would reduce the visual impact of the development from that neighbouring home when compared to the previous scheme. Indeed, as a consequence, I consider that it would not be overbearing. While the development would decrease the level of sunlight reaching the front garden of number 34, the extent to which this would occur would also be more limited than in the earlier scheme. Given this, and in the absence of any evidence to the contrary, I consider that the degree to which the development in this appeal would lessen sunlight in the front

garden of number 34 would be within acceptable limits. All in all, the scheme now proposed would not cause the dwelling at number 34 to be a materially less pleasant place to live.

14. A concern has also been raised about the effect of the scheme on the level of privacy at neighbouring homes. However, the Council considers the proposal acceptable in this regard, as did my colleague before. I similarly consider that, given the distance between the new windows proposed and neighbouring properties, combined with the obliqueness of the closest views involved, any overlooking would not be intrusive or materially harmful to neighbours' privacy.

### **Conditions**

15. I have considered the conditions suggested by the Council in the light of advice in Circular 11/95. As the existing building comprises both brick and stone, and given that the proposed development involves other materials including timber boarding, it is not sufficient to simply require that the new materials match the existing property. Consequently, to ensure that the proposed development has a satisfactory appearance, samples of the external materials to be used should be subject to the Council's approval. In addition, for the reason set out above, it is necessary to ensure that the main doorway into the existing house is retained with an opening door. Furthermore, otherwise than as set out in this decision and conditions, it is necessary that the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans, for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning. I shall impose appropriate conditions accordingly.
16. However, I disagree with the Council about the need for obscured glazing to the first floor en-suite and bathroom. Neither would be particularly close to the bungalow at number 34, or to the outdoor area closest to it where the bungalow's occupants could reasonably expect the greatest degree of privacy. Plain glass in these windows would not lead to an unacceptable reduction in privacy at number 34. Consequently, requiring obscured glass is not necessary to render the scheme acceptable. I shall not, therefore, include these conditions.

### **Conclusion**

17. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

*Simon Berkeley*

INSPECTOR



---

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 January 2013

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

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

**Decision date: 21 January 2013**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/N2535/A/12/2187100**

**Land at rear of 63 Silver Street, Bardney, Lincoln, LN3 5XG**

- 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 K Hippey against the decision of West Lindsey District Council.
  - The application Ref 128978, dated 13 July 2012, was refused by notice dated 14 September 2012.
  - The development proposed is a dwelling.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a dwelling on Land at rear of 63 Silver Street, Bardney, Lincoln, LN3 5XG in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 128978, dated 13 July 2012, subject to the following conditions:
  - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
  - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans numbered 48/12/01/A and 48/12/02/A.
  - 3) Notwithstanding condition 2, no development shall take place until details of all external, roofing and hard landscaping materials to be used in the development, including the surface of the driveway have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
  - 4) Notwithstanding condition 2, no development shall take place until a scheme for the disposal of foul and surface waters (from the roof, driveway and other external hard surfaces, e.g. pathways and patios) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved scheme.
  - 5) Notwithstanding condition 2, no development shall take place until details of the treatment of all boundaries of the site, including where appropriate fencing, walling and hedgerows to be provided or retained, or other means of enclosure, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
  - 6) Notwithstanding condition 2, no development shall take place until a scheme showing the construction details of the drive to include the protection of the drainage pipes and the preservation or relocation of the

associated manholes has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved scheme and the dwelling hereby approved shall not be occupied until the drive has been completed in accordance with the approved scheme.

- 7) No trees on the site shall be felled without the prior written consent of the local planning authority.
- 8) Notwithstanding the provisions of Classes A, B, C and E of Schedule 2, Part 1 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), the dwelling hereby permitted shall not be altered or extended, no new windows shall be inserted and no new buildings or structures shall be erected within the curtilage of the dwelling unless planning permission has first been granted by the local planning authority.

### **Main Issue**

2. The main issue is whether the proposal is acceptable having regard to policies concerning the supply of housing.

### **Reasons**

3. Saved Policy STRAT3 of the West Lindsey Local Plan First Review (LP) 2006 identifies Bardney as a Primary Rural Settlement. Saved LP Policy STRAT6 states that, within the boundaries of such settlements, limited small scale and infill housing development may be permitted provided, among other things, it is on previously developed land (pdl).
4. The appeal site represents the eastern half of a larger site, which had the benefit of outline planning permission Ref 120336 for 2 dwellings granted on 16 June 2007. At the date of that permission the site fell within the definition of previously developed land, as contained within Planning Policy Statement (PPS) 3 (Housing) at that time. That permission expired, but planning permission Ref 126055 was then granted on 19 August 2010 (the 2010 permission) for a dormer bungalow on the western half of the outline site. This was despite the fact that, in June 2010, the definition of pdl in PPS3 had been altered to exclude residential garden land. Of course such land is also now outside the definition of pdl in the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), but when LP Policy STRAT 6 was adopted, it was envisaged that development of garden land would be acceptable in principle as pdl. The decision notice for the 2010 permission indicated that the reasons for granting permission were the lack of detrimental impact on the character of the area or the amenities of neighbouring land and lack of harm in terms of drainage and highway safety. The notice made no reference to LP Policy STRAT6.
5. Although, in the light of the Government's intention to abolish Regional Spatial Strategies, the East Midlands Plan carries limited weight, in November 2010, the Council approved the use of the annual housing requirement figures from the East Midlands Plan, pending the preparation of the Central Lincolnshire Local Development Framework. The appellant says that, at the same time, and subject to some exceptions, the Council resolved to further restrict residential development because of a calculated over supply of housing against that

annual requirement. Whilst the 2010 permission came after the change in definition of pdl, it pre-dated the November 2010 resolution.

6. The Council does not rely on the November 2010 resolution in this appeal, but points to the fact that the Central Lincolnshire Housing Market Area Supply Assessment 2012 confirms that there is a supply in the District of 6.6 years against the overall policy requirements. This exceeds the requirement in the Framework for a 5 year supply plus a 5% buffer. However, it is important to note that the Framework requirement is a minimum, not a ceiling, and the "over supply" is relatively modest in this case.
7. Aside from the pdl limitation, LP Policy STRAT6 specifies other criteria, which must all be met before limited small scale or infill housing will be considered acceptable. These include, at STRAT6 (viii), that the proposal has no impact, either individually or cumulatively on the housing strategy of the LP, including in relation to the role of windfall housing and the phasing and release of land as set out in Policy STRAT9. In this regard, STRAT6 indicates that the cumulative impact of recent approved development proposals in the locality and wider area will be considered.
8. In providing for the phasing and release of land, saved LP Policy STRAT9 prioritises the development of pdl, but identifies 5 categories of land from A to E, in descending order of priority. The development of this site would provide some employment opportunities in the short term and support for local services in the long term, but it has not been suggested that its development is essential for the economic regeneration of the area. Accordingly, as 'Other Greenfield Land' (category E), the appeal site attracts the lowest priority under STRAT9, but it would have been 'Other Previously Developed Land' (Category C), prior to the redefinition of pdl.
9. As the site is not pdl, its development would be strictly contrary to LP Policy STRAT6 in any event. Given that permission has been granted for a dwelling on the western half of the original outline site; a new dwelling has recently been built on land to the rear of No 59 Silver Street; and I am told that there is outline permission for 5 dwellings immediately to the rear of No 67, I must have regard to the cumulative impact. However, 'limited small scale housing development', permissible in principle under LP Policy STRAT6 is defined as being in the range 5 – 10 houses. In that context, and having regard to the relatively modest over supply, a single dwelling would not have a significant effect on the Council's housing strategy, even in combination with the 7 or so other dwellings recently approved in the locality, and of which I have been made aware.
10. The appellant says that she has lived in the village for 28 years and intends to stay there, but wishes to live in a modern comfortable house. Local need is not a consideration under any LP Policy that has been drawn to my attention but, in any event, the appellant already has planning permission for a new house on the adjoining plot.
11. The site has been cleared of a significant number of trees and most of its grass. It is largely unseen from the public domain, but the opportunity to enhance the appearance of the site through development would be of some benefit to neighbouring occupiers. As the land to either side is to be developed, the proposal would be consistent with the emerging pattern of buildings.

12. Although outline permission was granted for the larger site and permission was then given for a dwelling on the site immediately to the west, even though it no longer constituted pdl, circumstances have changed in that the Council has formally recognised an 'over supply' of housing. However, it is a modest over supply and I have already found that the development of 1 house would not prejudice the housing strategy. Furthermore, this is a sustainable location.
13. I note the Parish Council's concerns regarding highway safety and flooding. However, there is no objection from the Highway Authority and my site inspection satisfied me that visibility at the site access is adequate in both directions. Suggested conditions concerning drainage can adequately address concerns over flooding.
14. I conclude on the main issue that, having regard to policies concerning the supply of housing and in particular, notwithstanding the conflict with saved LP Policies STRAT6 and STRAT9, due to the redefinition of pdl, the proposal is acceptable. My findings that the development would enhance the appearance of the site for neighbours; compliment the emerging pattern and grain of development in a sustainable location; and that there would be no significant detrimental impact on the Council's housing strategy, are all considerations which indicate that the appeal should be allowed.
15. In addition to the usual condition regarding the commencement of development, for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning, I am requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans. To safeguard the character and appearance of the area and neighbours' living conditions, I impose the Council's suggested conditions preventing the removal of trees and requiring details of external materials and boundary treatment to be submitted for approval. To ensure adequate drainage and to prevent pollution of the water environment I attach the suggested conditions requiring the submission of drainage details. In the interests of highway safety, I require the proposed driveway to be completed in accordance with approved details. To safeguard neighbours' privacy and living conditions and the character and appearance of the area and having regard to the backland location I restrict permitted development rights concerning alterations, enlargements, new buildings and windows, though this can be achieved with 1 condition and not 2, as proposed by the Council.

*J A Murray*

INSPECTOR