



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 October 2017

by D Guiver LLB(Hons) Solicitor

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

Decision date: 18 October 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/N2535/W/17/3177306

7 Grange Lane, Willingham by Stow, Gainsborough DN21 5LB

- 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 Mike Watson against the decision of West Lindsey District Council.
 - The application Ref 135950, dated 11 March 2017, was refused by notice dated 4 May 2017.
 - The development proposed is change of use of agricultural building to a single dwelling and extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for change of use of agricultural building to a single dwelling and extension at 7 Grange Lane, Willingham by Stow, Gainsborough DN21 5LB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 135950, dated 11 March 2017, 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 following approved plans: 'Proposed Block Plan', 'Proposed Access and Parking to 7 Grange Lane', 'Proposed Dwelling (elevations)' and 'Floor Plans – Proposed Dwelling'.
 - 3) The external surfaces and boundary treatments of the development hereby permitted shall be constructed in materials to match the existing structures.

Preliminary Matter

2. The description of the appeal site used by the appellant and the Council refers to the change of use of an agricultural building. While this might reflect the original use of the building, it was partly converted into bed and breakfast accommodation pursuant to planning permission granted in 2005.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of the occupiers of the host property and proposed dwelling with particular regard to parking.

Reasons

4. Willingham by Stow is a small rural village approximately five miles from Gainsborough. The appeal site is close to the eastern edge of the village and comprises a large detached house and an ancillary outbuilding, formerly an agricultural building and now used partly for bed and breakfast accommodation and partly for storage.
5. The proposed development is for the change of use of the existing building into a single dwelling. The development would require erection of a small extension to the eastern end of the outbuilding together with some minor internal construction works. The Council states that the proposed development would result in a substandard relationship between the proposed dwelling, the host dwelling and the surrounding area.
6. However, the Council states that the proposal is acceptable in principle and there are good transport links and access to local services so is a sustainable form of development. The Council also accepts that the scheme would not result in any detrimental impact on occupiers of other premises in terms of privacy, light or overbearing. The Council states that the visual impact of the scheme would not be detrimental to the character and appearance of the area.
7. In respect of the proposed dwelling, the Council accepts that the internal space exceeds the minimum standards for a two-bedroom property and that bedroom sizes are adequate. Similarly, the proposed garden space would provide sufficient external amenity space while leaving an adequate parcel of garden land for the host building.
8. The Council accepts that the driveway and turning space for cars proposed in the scheme is adequate for the dwelling and would still leave the host building with adequate vehicle space of its own. However, the Council states that the distance from the proposed dwelling to the car-parking area of approximately 30 metres would prevent the future occupiers from exercising any natural surveillance of parked vehicles. Because of the site layout, the driveway would not be visible from the proposed dwelling.
9. The Council gives little detail as to how the proposed parking arrangement has a detrimental impact on the relationship between the proposed dwelling and the host building and surrounding area. There is also no evidence before me to show how the arrangements would have a detrimental impact on the living conditions of the occupiers of the host building and neighbouring properties.
10. While there would be a significant distance between the driveway and the proposed dwelling, this is not an unusual occurrence. While future occupiers might not be able to carry out natural surveillance of the drive it would remain in the clear sight of the host property and several surrounding houses.
11. I consider that the distance between the drive and the proposed dwelling is unlikely to have any adverse impact on the living conditions of future occupiers, or the living conditions of the occupants of other properties. Therefore, I conclude that the proposal would be in accordance with policy LP26 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan 2017, which seeks to ensure that developments do not unduly harm the living conditions of the occupants of the proposed dwelling and neighbouring properties.

Conditions

12. I have imposed conditions based on those suggested by the Council. Where necessary I have amended the wording of these in the interests of precision and clarity in order to comply with the advice in the Planning Practice Guidance.
13. In the interests of proper planning I have imposed the standard conditions in respect of time limits. For certainty I have imposed a condition requiring compliance with the plans.
14. To protect the character and appearance of the area I have imposed a condition requiring external materials and boundary treatments to match the existing materials.
15. The application form confirms that foul and surface water drainage would be connected to existing sewers which the Council agreed was acceptable. Drainage would be dealt with by compliance with the application and I have therefore not imposed a drainage condition.

Conclusion

16. For the reasons given above, and taking into account all other material considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

D Guiver

INSPECTOR