
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 February 2017

by Nigel Harrison BA (Hons) MRTPI

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

Decision date: 10th February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/A3010/D/16/3158134

180 Raymoth Lane, Worksop, Nottinghamshire, S81 7DY

- 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 Mrs Fiona Richardson against the decision of Bassetlaw District Council.
 - The application Ref: 16/00564/HSE dated 25 April 2016 was refused by notice dated 13 July 2016.
 - The development proposed is a brick shed to the front of the property to store garden equipment.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a brick shed to the front of the property to store garden equipment at 180 Raymoth Lane, Worksop, Nottinghamshire, S81 7DY in accordance with the terms of the application Ref: 16/00564/HSE dated 25 April 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: Location Plan at 1:1250 scale; and unnumbered 1: 50 scale plan submitted with the application.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the shed hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing extension to the dwelling.

Main Issue

2. The Council has raised no objections to the proposal in terms of its impact on the character and appearance of the area, or on the living conditions of neighbours. From what I have seen and read I find no reason to disagree. I therefore consider the one main issue in this case is whether the proposal would lead to an increased demand for on-street parking in the area, and if so, whether it would adversely affect highway safety.

Reasons

3. The appeal relates to a semi-detached house and garden at the head of a cul-de-sac fronting Raymoth Lane. It is proposed to erect a modest-sized shed measuring 2m x 3m in plan, with an eaves height of 2.0m and a ridge height of
-

- 3.5m. Construction materials are facing brickwork and roof tiles to match those of a previous extension.
4. The Highway Authority has raised objections to the proposal on the basis that it would be built on the existing driveway and would result in the loss of one of two existing parking spaces, leading to overspill parking on the highway and potential danger and obstruction being caused to other road users. However, as was clear from my site visit and the evidence, the shed would be erected on an area of former planting abutting the side boundary, leaving the existing paved front parking area unaffected. As such, there would be no impact on the amount of off-street parking currently available at the property.
 5. The Council has referred to a number of policies from the *Bassetlaw Core Strategy and Development Management Policies DPD*, adopted 2011 (CS1, CS2 and DM4). However, these are not referred to in the decision notice and do not seem to have any direct bearing on the appeal proposal. Similarly, although the Highway Authority has referred to the Council's parking policy; I have not been provided with a copy. Therefore I cannot comment on it.
 6. Overall, I am satisfied that the proposal would not lead to an increased demand for on-street parking in the area, and there would be no impact on highway safety.
 7. I have considered the conditions put forward by the Council in the light of the advice in the *Government's Planning practice Guidance*. In addition to the standard time condition, a condition requiring matching materials is needed in the interests of the appearance of the area. A condition to secure compliance with the submitted plans is also needed for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.
 8. Therefore, for the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Nigel Harrison

INSPECTOR