



## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 October 2022

**by Paul Martinson BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 21 October 2022**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/N2535/W/22/3301300**

**Land at Station Road, Grasby, Lincolnshire DN38 6AP**

- 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 Messrs Paul and Neil Knaption against the decision of West Lindsey District Council.
  - The application Ref 144527, dated 2 March 2022, was refused by notice dated 22 April 2022.
  - The development proposed is described as 'Erection of 4 no. dwellings (with all matters aside from access and layout reserved for subsequent consideration)'.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Preliminary Matters

2. The planning application was submitted in outline form seeking approval for access and layout with scale, appearance and landscaping reserved for future consideration. I have determined the appeal on this basis, treating the submitted plans and details provided as illustrative, insofar as they relate to scale, appearance and landscaping.
3. An extant outline planning permission<sup>1</sup> exists on the site for the erection of two dwellings.

### Main Issue

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

### Reasons

5. The appeal site consists of part of an agricultural field located along Station Road, a minor road leading out of the village of Grasby. The site abuts residential development to the north. The boundary of the garden of the dwelling at 26 Station Road, runs along the full extent of the northern edge of the appeal site.
6. The dwellings along this side of the road tend to be set back considerably from the road edge and comprise of large, two storey detached dwellings on substantial plots with sizeable gardens extending to the rear. On the site visit I saw that the depth of front gardens increases steadily from north to south along Station Road. Backland development is nonetheless rare. The front

---

<sup>1</sup> Ref 140515.

boundaries are typically verdant in character with the hedges to the front reflecting the hedgerow along the part of the road frontage of the appeal site. There are residential properties opposite the appeal site that are located relatively close to the road. Nevertheless, the large dwellings to the opposite side of the road, set back behind verdant boundaries within extensive rear gardens give a spacious and coherent pattern of development to the streetscene here.

7. The proposed layout plan shows the proposed dwellings arranged in two rows with a two dwellings to the site frontage and a further two 'barn-like structures' to the rear. In order to accommodate this tandem arrangement, the frontage dwellings are required to be set substantially forward of the dwelling of No 26 and its immediate neighbours. This would be distinctly at odds with the pattern of development of increasing front garden depth that is prevalent here.
8. Furthermore, the backland structures to the rear would be set well back from the frontage dwellings with smaller rear gardens. They would likely be easily visible along the proposed access from which they would appear at odds with the spacious character of the area. Whilst the appellant has designed this to be '*reminiscent of agricultural crew-yards*', this is not a characteristic of the streetscene along Station Road. Overall, the proposal would represent an incongruous form of development that would clearly and adversely stand out alongside the existing development along Station Road.
9. The Council considers that the proposal would set a precedent for similar developments. Whilst I accept that each application and appeal must be treated on its individual merits, I appreciate that approval of this proposal could be used in support of housing proposals within the rear gardens of properties along Station Road or other similar schemes. Application for such proposals could be difficult to resist and the cumulative effect of these would exacerbate the harm which I have described above.
10. The appellant has directed me to the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) with regard to effective and efficient use of land. However, for the reasons set out above I have found that the proposal would not represent an efficient or effective use of the land due to the harm to character and appearance.
11. For the above reasons the proposal would result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore conflict with Policy LP26 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan (2017) (the CLLP) which, in summary and amongst other things, seeks to ensure new development provides high quality sustainable design that contributes positively to local character, landscape and townscape. There would also be conflict with paragraph 130 of the Framework which requires that planning decisions ensure developments add to the overall quality of the area, are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and landscaping, and are sympathetic to local character.

### **Other Matters**

12. The development of windfall sites in locations such as this is generally supported through both the Framework and CLLP. However, whilst all dwellings contribute to housing supply, in this case the delivery of two additional dwellings, having regard to the extant planning permission, would only make a

limited contribution to the existing stock. Whilst the appellant has referred to the houses as being 'affordable' there is nothing before me to demonstrate that what is proposed would amount to affordable housing<sup>2</sup>. As such the benefits of the scheme in this regard are relatively limited.

13. In terms of other benefits provided by the appellant, I accept that economic benefits would arise from the construction and occupation of the new houses. Nonetheless for the reasons outlined above, given the scale of the proposal, these comparatively minor benefits would not outweigh the harm that would arise.

### **Conclusion**

14. For the above reasons, having taken account of the development plan as a whole, the approach in the Framework, and with regard to all other relevant material considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*Paul Martinson*

INSPECTOR

---

<sup>2</sup> As defined in the Glossary to the Framework.