

**RECENT APPEAL DECISIONS TO THE END OF NOVEMBER 2010**

**Application Ref: S10/0887/FULL PJM**  
**Planning Inspectorate No: APP/E2530/A/10/2132340/NWF**

Appeal Type: **Written Evidence**

Appellant:	Artistic Iron Prods/Bennington Carriages
Proposal:	Variation of Condition 8, 9 and 11 and removal of Condition 12 of Planning Approval S09/1423
Site:	Sparrow Lane, Long Bennington, Newark, Notts, NG23 5DL

Appeal Decision – Date:	Appeal allowed with conditions - 18 November 2010
-------------------------	---

**SUMMARY**

To be reported at later date

**Application Ref: S10/1058/FULL PJM**  
**Planning Inspectorate No: APP/E2530/A/10/2133131/WF**

Appeal Type: **Written Evidence**

Appellant:	Mr S Pocock
Proposal:	Erection of dwelling
Site:	14, Back Lane, Long Bennington, Newark, NG23 5DT

Appeal Decision – Date:	Appeal dismissed - 18 November 2010
-------------------------	-------------------------------------

**SUMMARY**

To be reported at later date

**Application Ref: S10/1253/HSJ JST**  
**Planning Inspectorate No: APP/E2530/D/10/2137000**

Appeal Type: **Written Evidence**

Appellant:	Gary Fane
Proposal:	First floor extension to garage
Site:	5, Blackthorn Close, Deeping St James, Peterborough, PE6 8TA

Appeal Decision – Date:	Appeal allowed - 11 November 2010
-------------------------	-----------------------------------

**SUMMARY**

To be reported at later date

**Application Ref: S10/1102/OUT PWM**  
**Planning Inspectorate No: APP/E2530/A/10/2135555/WF**

Appeal Type: **Written Evidence**

Appellant:	Mr Brian Streeter
Proposal:	Erection of dwelling
Site:	R/o Churston, Back Lane & 10 South Parade, Caythorpe, Grantham, NG323BT

Appeal Decision – Date:	Appeal dismissed - 26 November 2010
-------------------------	-------------------------------------

**SUMMARY**

This application was refused under delegated powers as it was considered:

1. That the plot was too small for a dwelling and would lead to a cramped form of development not in keeping with the form and character of the surrounding development
2. That there would be inadequate amenity space for a dwelling in a village context
3. That it would be visually intrusive and discordant in the streetscene which would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the area and the setting of the Conservation Area
4. Detrimental to the residential amenities of the occupiers of the adjacent property through dominance of outlook

The Inspector generally agreed with reason 3 of the officer assessment, although he disagreed with the other reasons, considering that the plot was large enough for a dwelling with adequate private amenity space. He also considered that the blank two storey gable end adjacent to the boundary with no 10 was sufficiently far from this property to have minimal impact on the residential amenities of the occupiers of the adjacent property. The appeal was **dismissed**.

No application for costs was made by either party.

**Application Ref: S10/1210/FULL PWM**  
**Planning Inspectorate No: APP/E2530/A/10/2134695/WF**

Appeal Type: **Written Evidence**

Appellant:	Mr James Waspe
Proposal:	Change of use of agricultural land to domestic gardens
Site:	Land r/o 27, 29, 31 & 33 Kings Hill, Caythorpe, Grantham, NG32 3DJ

Appeal Decision – Date:	Appeal allowed with conditions - 17 November 2010
-------------------------	---

**SUMMARY**

This application was refused under delegated powers as it was considered to be an excessive and inappropriate encroachment into open countryside which would be visually intrusive and have a detrimental urbanising impact on the rural appearance and character of the area.

The Inspector disagreed with this assessment, considering that notwithstanding the fact that the extended gardens would be almost doubled in size, the proposal's impact from public vantage points and on the open countryside would be minimal. He also considered the fact that the sides would be enclosed by existing field boundaries and a hedgerow was proposed on the west boundary went in favour of the application. The appeal was **allowed**.

No application for costs was made by either party.

