
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 September 2016

by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

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

Decision date: 22 September 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/A2470/D/16/3155483

4 Stretton Road, Greetham, Rutland LE15 7NP

- 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 M Imison against the decision of Rutland Council.
 - The application Ref 2016/0280/FUL, dated 16 March 2016, was refused by notice dated 9 May 2016.
 - The development proposed is a new vehicular access and car park.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a new vehicular access and car park at 4 Stretton Road, Greetham, Rutland LE15 7NP in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2016/0280/FUL, dated 16 March 2016, 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 approved plan 714/15/1F.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. Number 4 Stretton Road is a two storey terraced dwelling with an elongated front garden which runs parallel to others in the street scene. There are two distinct four building terraces which are set a considerable distance back from the highway. They are separated by a shared private driveway which leads to a communal rear parking area. There is a narrow and slightly inclined grass verge separating the front edge of the garden from the footway which becomes wider and more pronounced further east of the appeal site. Front and side boundary treatments to gardens vary but are mainly hedges as well fencing of differing designs, materials and heights.
 4. The proposed development would create a vehicle cross over from the carriageway to a formal parking area in the furthest forward section of the front garden. This would involve breaching the grass verge. Whilst I accept that the verge contributes to the character and appearance of the street scene, the proposed development would only be a single vehicle width with a strip of
-

verge retained to its centre and thus the majority of the verge would be retained. In addition, the proposed development would be read in the context of the noticeably wider breaches to the verge which form accesses to the aforementioned communal parking area and the private driveway leading to the front of No 2 Stretton Road.

5. When taking these factors together along with the variety of front and side boundary treatments in the area, the proposed development would not be unduly harmful to the character and appearance of the street scene.
6. With regard to the parking area itself I note that this would be cut partially into the ground and as such its visual effect would be minimised when also considered in the context of surrounding planting. The use of the paving proposed is not uncommon a feature of the area and as such, in the context of my findings above, would not have an urbanising effect.
7. I acknowledge the possible precedent value of granting a planning permission for the proposed development. Aside from the fact that each development proposal would be considered on its own merits, I have given weight in my findings to the juxtaposition of the appeal site to other similar and more prominent vehicular access points, specifically those at No 2 and to the east of No 8 Stretton Road. I note that from No 10 and further east the grass verge remains largely intact and more substantial, thereby forming more of a prominent and defining feature of the street scene. I conclude therefore that allowing the appeal would not create a harmful precedent.
8. For the above reasons, the proposed development would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. As such it would not conflict with Policy CS19 of the Core Strategy¹ or Policy SP15 the Local Plan². These Policies, along with section 7 of the Framework³, seek to ensure that, amongst other things; new development is of a contextually appropriate design and appearance, makes a positive contribution to local character and reinforces distinctiveness.

Other Matters

9. I note the Council's reference to paragraph 134 of the Framework and the quoted Policies of the Development Plan relevant to the historic environment. As the site is not within a Conservation Area there is no requirement to consider whether the proposed development preserves or enhances its character or appearance. I have nevertheless had regard in my findings to the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area. Specifically the street scene. I have concluded that, for the reasons set out above, there would be no harm arising out of the proposed development in this respect.

Conditions

10. As well as the standard time condition, I have set out the approved plans for certainty.

¹ Rutland Local Development Framework: Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2011

² Rutland Local Plan: Site Allocations and Policies Development Plan Document 2014

³ The National Planning Policy Framework 2012

Conclusion

11. For the reasons and subject to the conditions set out above, the appeal is allowed.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR