



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 October 2017

by **S Jones MA DipLP**

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

Decision date: 16<sup>th</sup> November 2017.

---

### Appeal Ref: APP/L2440/W/17/3177868

#### 1 Ladysmith Road, Wigston LE18 4UZ

- 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 Kotak against the decision of Oadby & Wigston Borough Council.
  - The application Ref 16/00377/COU, dated 21 August 2016, was refused by notice dated 19 March 2017.
  - The development proposed is proposed change of use from existing offices to nursery that will accommodate up to 26 children.
- 

#### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

#### Preliminary Matter

2. The original application referred to up to a maximum of 26 children. The appellant referred in the appeal to a revised maximum of 15 children accompanied by further documents. Although this revised number has been brought to the Council's attention in the course of the appeal, I have determined the appeal based on the original maximum of 26 children.

#### Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on:
  - the character and appearance of the area with particular regard to the security fence and vehicle parking
  - protected trees
  - whether the site is a suitable location for the proposed nursery.

#### Reasons

##### *Character and Appearance*

4. The appeal property is a former Ministry of Defence (MoD) single storey building in a surrounding residential area of former MoD housing located across a grassed area of land on the west corner of Ladysmith Road and Hindcostan Avenue. The building is in a poor state of repair and is surrounded by a large number of trees protected by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO). It would undergo renovation to provide the nursery facility and for security the outdoor area would be fenced.

5. The area is characterised by modest housing on narrow roads amongst generous areas of green space with a high number of mature trees, many of which are protected under the TPO covering the estate. Frontages are largely open plan with few individual fences, hedges or other boundary markers in the vicinity of the site.
6. By necessity given the need to protect and secure small children, the proposed fencing would be a substantial wire mesh 2m high security fence enclosing the open area directly in front of the appeal site. Its significant height, length and commercial design would appear harsh and incongruous amongst the modest domestic housing and garaging that surrounds the site, and would harm the open plan character of the area.
7. It was not disputed that a significant number of vehicles would be connected to the proposed use; in particular I must have regard to the maximum possible use if all 26 childrens places were taken up. Provision of a mini-bus service could potentially reduce that impact although this would depend on parental choice. The appellant suggested that extra staff parking could be found in public car parks offsite, but there is nothing to guarantee that this would be the case.
8. Inadequate parking provision for staff and/or customers of the nursery facilities would result in overspill. The creation of staff spaces and customer spaces and associated path would hardsurface a significant part of the site which exacerbated by overspill vehicle parking littering the open plan verges and frontages of the estate would be out of keeping with the surrounding area and would considerably harm the green low density open plan character and appearance of the area and be contrary to paragraphs 60 and 64 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

#### *Protected Trees*

9. Works within the proposed development to enclose the proposed play with fencing, and create a hardsurfaced area for vehicles with a hardsurfaced footpath across to the nursery would be undertaken in very close proximity to several trees protected by a TPO. Concerns were raised that without suitable protective measures, the development could damage the trees or cause them to die off. There are several documents referring to root protection systems and showing different sizes and locations for the proposed vehicle hardstanding. A Tree Survey was submitted with the appeal but there was no assessment of the suitability of the siting of the parking, footpath or fencing with regard to the protected trees.
10. The Councils officers report also refers to the concern of the Arboricultural Officer that protected trees were not compatible with the nursery use due to a potential for risk to children from trees and a risk to trees from children. He stated some of the tree species were unsuitable for a play area for children because of their tendency to shed branches. The introduction of the use could result in the felling or relocation of TPO trees. The officer report goes on to speculate about any effect on trees, but no specific measures were put forward by the appellant to mitigate any harm or risk arising to the TPO trees. In consideration of all these factors, I am not satisfied that adequate measures would be in place to protect and enhance the natural environment with regard to the trees because of their value to the local environment and its enjoyment of it by the public.

### *Location of the Nursery*

11. Policy 16 of the Oadby and Wigston Core Strategy Development Plan Document identifies community uses such as the proposed nursery to be primarily suited to town centre sites, district centres and local centres. This location does not fall into any of those categories. However, based on the information I have in this appeal, I consider the policy states 'Generally' rather than being restrictive. Whether or not in a preferred location, the criteria set out in the policy go on to indicate a number of reasons why a particular location might be supported, including sufficient parking, and positively reflecting the character and appearance of its surroundings.
12. Applying those criteria to this site, whilst it is in a suburban location and some bus routes are noted there is little evidence to show that the development would fulfil these criteria with regard to good accessibility to transport. Insufficient parking was one of the concerns expressed by the many objectors and the Council, and I concurred with them that the likelihood is there would not be sufficient provision with a consequent impact outside the development. Furthermore, based on my findings about character and appearance above, the proposal would not positively reflect its surroundings. Therefore the development would not satisfy several of the criteria in Policy 16 even if the locational preferences were dispensed with.

### **Planning Balance**

13. The appellant states that there are waiting lists for local nurseries and a new one is needed. The development would result in the renovation of a deteriorating building and provide local community facilities, together with associated employment. However, despite these advantages the location would not be supported under Policy 16 and I find that the commercial use would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area and would not properly ensure the continuing protection of the trees covered by the TPO. There are no other matters including the identified benefits that would outweigh this harm. Therefore I conclude that the development would conflict with Policy 16 of the Oadby and Wigston Core Strategy Development Plan Document and the aims of the National Planning Policy Framework which together amongst other things seek to secure high quality sustainable development that reflects its surroundings and protects and enhances the natural environment.

### **Other Matters**

14. I have taken account of the points raised in the objections to the development. I also note the roads accessing the proposed development fall within the remit of South Wigston Residents Company Ltd, a residents management company. However, additional expense falling upon residents to subsidise impact from the development would not be covered by the development plan or other considerations in respect of the planning merits of this case.

### **Conclusion**

15. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

S Jones

INSPECTOR

Previous 08/00329/FUL - conversion to 2 single storey dwellings  
10/00346/FUL - conversion to bungalow <sup>refused</sup>  
But not implemented <sup>permitted</sup> - ran out of <sup>time</sup> lapsed



## Borough of Oadby & Wigston

Directorate of Community Services

Mr Kotak  
C/O Mr Sajjad Ibrahim  
65 Greenacre Drive  
Leicester  
LE5 6TE

E-mail: [planning@oadby-wigston.gov.uk](mailto:planning@oadby-wigston.gov.uk)  
Web Site: [www.oadby-wigston.gov.uk](http://www.oadby-wigston.gov.uk)

Please ask for: Tony Boswell  
Extension: (0116) 2572710  
Application No: 16/00377/COU  
Your ref: PP-05421049  
Decision Date: 21st March 2017  
Date Received: 19th September 2016

### TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990

### REFUSAL OF PLANNING PERMISSION

The Oadby & Wigston Borough Council **REFUSE** planning permission

**Proposed change of use from existing offices to nursery that will accommodate up to 26 children.**

**1 Ladysmith Road, Wigston, Leicestershire, LE18 4UZ**

The reason(s) for the refusal are:

- 1 The area surrounding the application is **one of strong local character and local distinctiveness**, largely due to its origins as an MoD designed and built residential estate. In particular but not exclusively this is characterised by narrow privately maintained carriageways, verges and high quality and mature landscaping. Having had regard to that **local distinctiveness** the Council object to the proposed reuse of the existing storage building as a childrens' nursery for the following reasons:
  - a) As a use within Use Class D1 outside any nearby town centre, the proposed use is not justified by any persuasive sequential test.
  - b) The proposed arrangements for the reception and collection of children attending the premises are impractical and inadequate. At peak times this inadequacy would encourage drivers to park on nearby verges causing damage and visual harm. (Noting that carriageways and landscaping are privately maintained at cost to local residents).
  - c) The proposals do not include adequate day long operational car parking provision for employees at the premises with similar effects to b) above.
  - d) The entirety of the application site is the subject of a Tree Preservation Order, including the proposed external play area. The management of risks associated with that play area would pose a threat to the long term future of some of the relevant preserved trees due to potential branch fall, compaction of roots or other causes.
  - e) The proposed 2 metre high wire mesh security fence would erode the visual amenity of the open area concerned and that defect could not be mitigated by the use of an alternative design or specification of fence.

**The proposal would therefore be contrary to paragraphs 24, 60, 64 and 118 (in particular) of the National Planning Policy Framework, and Policy 16 of the adopted Oadby and Wigston Core Strategy.**

Note(s) to Applicant:

- 1 For the avoidance of doubt this refusal relates to the following plans and particulars:-



**Council Offices: Station Road, Wigston, Leicestershire LE18 2DR**  
**Tel: (0116) 288 8961 Fax: (0116) 288 7828 Minicom: (0116) 257 2726**

Drawings showing the following particulars;  
Sheet 2 Existing and proposed Floor Plans (undated)  
Sheet 2 Proposed elevations (undated)  
Boundary mesh fencing detail (undated)

- 2 In dealing with the application, through ongoing dialogue and the proper consideration of the proposal in accordance with Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, the local planning authority have attempted to work with the applicant in a positive and proactive manner based on seeking solutions to problems arising in relation to dealing with the planning application as required by the National Planning Policy Framework (paragraphs 186 and 187) and in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015. However, in this instance, it has not been possible to overcome the concerns raised and the proposal remains in conflict with the provisions of the Development Plan and therefore the application has been refused.

3 **Appeals to the Secretary of State**

If you are aggrieved by the decision of your local planning authority to refuse permission for the proposed development or to grant it subject to conditions, then you can appeal to the Secretary of State under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

If you want to appeal against your local planning authority's decision then you must do so within 6 months of the date of this notice.

Appeals must be made using a form which you can get from the Planning Inspectorate at Temple Quay House, 2 The Square, Temple Quay, Bristol BS1 6PN (Telephone 0303 444 5000) or online at [www.gov.uk/appeal-planning-inspectorate](http://www.gov.uk/appeal-planning-inspectorate)

The Secretary of State can allow a longer period for giving notice of an appeal, but he will not normally be prepared to use this power unless there are special circumstances which excuse the delay in giving notice of appeal.

The Secretary of State need not consider an appeal if it seems to the Secretary of State that the local planning authority could not have granted planning permission for the proposed development or could not have granted it without the conditions they imposed, having regard to the statutory requirements, to the provisions of any development order and to any directions given under a development order.

**Purchase Notices**

If either the local planning authority or the Secretary of State refuses permission to develop land or grants it subject to conditions, the owner may claim that he can neither put the land to a reasonably beneficial use in its existing state nor render the land capable of a reasonably beneficial use by the carrying out of any development which has been or would be permitted.

In these circumstances, the owner may serve a purchase notice on the Council (District Council, London Borough Council or Common Council of the City of London) in whose area the land is situated. This notice will require the Council to purchase his interest in the land in accordance with the provisions of Part VI of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.



Anne Court  
Director of Services

Date: 21<sup>st</sup> March 2017



*Council Offices: Station Road, Wigston, Leicestershire LE18 2DR*  
*Tel: (0116) 288 8961 Fax: (0116) 288 7828 Minicom: (0116) 257 2726*