
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 July 2017

by D Guiver LLB(Hons) Solicitor

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

Decision date: 01 August 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/N2535/D/17/3175478

33 Sudbrooke Lane, Nettleham, Lincoln LN2 2RW

- 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 Darren Clawson against the decision of West Lindsey District Council.
 - The application Ref 135758, dated 31 January 2017, was refused by notice dated 27 March 2017.
 - The development proposed is the erection of new single detached garage and conversion of existing integral garage to utility room.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Preliminary Matter

3. Since the date of the decision the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan 2017 (the Local Plan) has been adopted and therefore this appeal is determined in accordance with that Plan. However, Policies LP17 and LP26 of the Local Plan, on which the Council now relies, do not differ from Policies STRAT1 and RES11 of the former West Lindsey Local Plan 2006 referred to in the decision notice in any material way that would affect my determination of this appeal.

Reasons

4. Sudbrooke Lane is a residential street within a rural village with houses set well back from the road. The appeal site sits to the north of the road and has a similar sized plot, and the building occupies a similar sized footprint, to other properties in the vicinity. To the front of the plot there is a footpath and a wide grass verge, which creates a sense of space in the street.
5. There are a number of large, mature trees close to the appeal site, either on the grass verge or within neighbouring plots that add to the open, rural feel of the area. The majority of houses in the vicinity are bungalows, although many have extended accommodation into the roof space. The land slopes down at a shallow angle from the footpath towards the houses to the north of the road, which consequently appear low in their plots.

6. The proposal is to construct a detached garage with a pitched roof to the front of the property. The structure would sit 2.5 metres or so back from the front boundary and would be built behind the existing shrubbery, although a small tree would be removed. The roof ridge of the garage would rise to a point a metre or so higher than the eaves of the existing building, but being close to the road it would also sit slightly uphill from the house.
7. I consider that the open aspect of the street is an important defining element of the character and appearance of the area. There are a number of garages in the area serving other properties, though these are generally built to the side of the host buildings. The appellant refers to a number of other garages within the village but by reason of location away from the appeal site these do not impact on the character and appearance of Sudbrooke Lane. The proposed development would be the only such structure in the vicinity to sit in front of the host property. The position of the proposed garage would intrude into the open view of the street and would therefore be an incongruous and alien addition to the area.
8. Although the proposed garage would be partially screened by landscaping and planting, the structure would remain visible. I consider that the landscaping proposals would not be sufficient to overcome the detrimental effect of the structure on the character and appearance of the area.
9. Therefore, the proposed development would not be in accordance with Policies LP17 and LP26 of the Local Plan, which together seek to ensure that development protects and enhances the character and appearance of an area and preserves important views within settlements. The proposal would also not accord with Policy D-6 of the Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan 2015, which seeks to ensure proposals incorporate adequate landscaping to mitigate any visual impact and ensure that developments merge into the existing village context.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, and taking into consideration all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

D Guiver

INSPECTOR