

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 December 2016

**by I Radcliffe BSc(Hons) MRTPI MCIEH DMS**

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

**Decision date: 23 December 2016**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/B3030/D/16/3157565**

**Stud Farm House, Ossington Lane, Sutton on Trent, Newark on Trent, Nottinghamshire NG23 6NX**

- 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 Robert Siddall against the decision of Newark & Sherwood District Council.
  - The application Ref 16/00479/FUL, dated 19 March 2016, was refused by notice dated 8 June 2016.
  - The development proposed is the replacement of existing two bay timber garages with new three bay steel and masonry garage.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the replacement of the existing two bay timber garages with a new three bay steel and masonry garage at Stud Farm House, Ossington Lane, Sutton on Trent, Newark on Trent, Nottinghamshire NG23 6NX in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 16/00479/FUL, dated 19 March 2016, subject to the following conditions:
  - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
  - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: SF-01, SF-03.
  - 3) Notwithstanding condition 2, no development shall take place until details of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted, including the external doors to the building, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

### Main Issue

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

### Reasons

3. Stud Farm House is an impressive large detached house with steps up to the front door and high ceilings. It is set within particularly spacious gardens well back from Ossington Lane with the complex of Stud Farm set slightly further to the north. To the east, beyond the farm complex are a number of industrial buildings. Other than in relation to the development described the appeal site
-

is in an isolated location in the countryside. At present, the dwelling is served by a two bay open fronted timber garage set back to the side of the house. The appellant proposes to replace with a far larger structure in order to house his vehicles, which include a tall antique steam roller and traction wagon.

4. Consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework ('the Framework'), policies DM5 and DM6 of the Newark and Sherwood Allocations and Development Management Development Plan Document (A&DMDPD) support the erection of curtilage buildings, subject to high quality design that respects the host dwelling and surrounding area. The '*Householder Development*' supplementary planning document (SPD), to which I have had due regard, provides more specific detail.
5. The proposed garage at 5.1m to the ridge of its dual pitched roof and 12.5m in width and length would be a tall building with a large footprint. However, the house would be significantly taller than the garage and its scale and mass would be notably greater. In combination with its location, set well back to the side of the house and largely screened from view by tall mature evergreen planting, it would be a subservient building that in terms of scale would not compete with the house visually. Given the large gardens that surround the property the garage would be comfortably accommodated and more than sufficient amenity space would remain.
6. In keeping with the house, the garage would have a gabled ended roof. Whilst its gables would form the front and rear elevations of the building, rather than the side elevations as with the house, this would not be a discordant feature. The pitch of the roof would not be as steep as the roof to the house. However, this serves to reduce the scale of the garage and given that it would be a detached building, set well back from the front elevation of the house and to its side, the garage would not be prominent enough for this feature to adversely affect the character and appearance of the dwelling.
7. The house is predominantly rendered. However, there are sufficient areas of exposed brickwork to the base of its walls for a garage built from brick to complement its appearance. The roof would be clad in profile steel sheets. Normally this would give the building a utilitarian industrial appearance similar to those on Stud Farm or on the site further to the east. However, the proposed brick parapet with stone coping to the front and rear gable ends of the building would avoid this from occurring. I note that the plans state that the doors to the garage would be metal roller shutters. This potentially would result in a more industrial look than would be appropriate for a residential ancillary building. However, this matter could be controlled by condition.
8. Taking all these matters into account, I therefore conclude that the proposed development is well designed, in compliance with the SPD guidance in relation to garages and outbuildings, and would complement the character and appearance of the house and area. It would therefore comply with policy DM5 and DM6 of the A&DMDPD, the SPD and the Framework.

#### *Conditions*

9. Otherwise than as set out in the conditions, for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning, the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans. In order to ensure that the development complements its surroundings, external materials, including those used on the doors to the building, need to complement the house. I have required these matters by condition.

10. Conditions have been suggested by Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust. However, the Council in the appeal questionnaire has not stated that they are necessary. In my assessment, as they relate to duties identified by the wildlife survey under other statutes it is not necessary to include them as conditions. Furthermore, the appellant having commissioned the survey will be familiar with the survey advice.

**Conclusion**

11. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal should be allowed.

*Ian Radcliffe*

Inspector