

RECENT APPEAL DECISIONS TO 17 MARCH 2012

Application Ref: S10/0142/EIAOL CM

Planning Inspectorate No: APP/E2530/A/11/2150609

Appeal Type: **Public Inquiry**

Appellant:	Larkfleet Homes, R & S Pask, Namulas Pension Trustees Ltd, Trustees, A J Snarey, HPC Homes Ltd, Larkfleet Ltd
Proposal:	Sustainable urban extension to Grantham comprising: at least 1000 dwelling houses; a continuing care retirement community; a neighbourhood centre (incorporating a primary school, primary healthcare and community assembly facilities (UCO Class D1) and small scale (maximum 750 sq m) convenience shopping (UCO Class A); Public House/Lodge Hotel; ancillary (formal (playing field/play areas) and informal) open space, including structural landscaping and biodiversity enhancement areas; and access works (including alterations to the A607/Belton Lane junction). Land to the north of Grantham (bounded by the East Coast main railway line, by Belton Lane and High Road (A607), Manthorpe), Lincs
Site:	Land north of Grantham bound by railway, Belton Lane/High Road (A607), Manthorpe, Grantham

Appeal Decision – Date:	Appeal dismissed - 01 March 2012
-------------------------	----------------------------------

SUMMARY

Members may recall a planning application for the above was refused and the subject of an appeal. The chosen appeal route was a public inquiry. As the proposed appeal involves a residential development over 150 units and over 5 hectares which would significantly impact on the Government's objective to secure a better balance between housing demand and supply and create high quality, sustainable, mixed and inclusive communities the appeal was recovered by the Secretary of State to determine.

The Inspector prepared a comprehensive report to the Secretary of State. The conclusions of the Secretary of State are summarised below:

“The Secretary of State agrees with the Inspector's overall conclusions. He considers that the proposal is consistent with the strategic policy of substantial new development at Grantham, and that it would provide up to 200 dwellings towards the shortfall in the 5 year land supply, including affordable and specialist housing. However, there are a number of factors weighing against the proposal. These include; the heritage and highways harm; conflicts with the development plan, including the risk to the delivery of the CS sustainable urban extensions and associated road schemes; some concerns about sustainability; and, prejudice to the emerging GAAP, which should determine the scale, location and phasing of housing development at Grantham.

Having weighed up all of the relevant material considerations, the Secretary of State considers that the proposal conflicts with the development plan and national planning policies in a number of respects and though there are material considerations weighing in its favour, these are not sufficient to outweigh this conflict”.

Application Ref: S11/2014/HSH SP
Planning Inspectorate No: APP/E2530/D/11/2165091

Appeal Type: **Written Representation**

Appellant:	Mr & Mrs J Cowling
Proposal:	Two storey extension to front to form habitable rooms and single storey front extension to form utility room and double garage and relocate vehicular access
Site:	4A, Belton Lane, Grantham, NG31 9HL

Appeal Decision – Date:	Appeal dismissed - 22 February 2012
-------------------------	-------------------------------------

Application Ref: S11/2612/HSH SP
Planning Inspectorate No: app/e2530/d/12/2168079

Appeal Type: **Written Representation**

Appellant:	Mr & Mrs J Cowling
Proposal:	Two storey and single storey front extensions to dwelling
Site:	4A, Belton Lane, Grantham, Lincolnshire, NG31 9HL

Appeal Decision – Date:	Appeal allowed with conditions - 22 February 2012
-------------------------	---

SUMMARY

APPEAL DECISIONS – 4A BELTON LANE, GRANTHAM. APPLICATIONS REFERENCE S11/2014/HSH & S11/2612/HSH.

The above applications for two storey and single storey extensions to the front of 4A Belton Lane, were refused last year on grounds of dominance, impact on the street scene and neighbours, and highway safety. Both applications were similar in nature, the difference between the two applications being that under the second application the extensions were 'handed' and pulled away from the front boundary, and a new access was not proposed.

The applicant appealed against both decisions, which were jointly considered by the Inspector whose decision has now been issued. The Inspector dismissed the appealed against the first application (S11/2014/HSH) for the following reasons:

- The effect of the garage (close to the front boundary) would be harmful to the street scene.
- The new access would not be safe

The Inspector allowed the second application for the following reasons:

- There would not be any appreciable harm to the street scene.
- There would not be any over bearing impact on neighbours and privacy could be secured through condition preventing intervisibility.