
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 October 2017

by D. M. Young BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI MIHE

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

Decision date: 24 October 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/P3040/D/17/3181218

The Old Coach House, 45 Main Street, Rempstone LE12 6RJ.

- 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 Mark Footitt against the decision of Rushcliffe Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 17/01071/FUL, dated 10 May 2017, was refused by notice dated 6 July 2017.
 - The development proposed is the change in position of proposed apex brick & tile double garage, previously approved under application 15/02944/FUL.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the change in position of proposed apex brick & tile double garage, previously approved under application 15/02944/FUL at The Old Coach House, 45 Main Street, Rempstone LE12 6RJ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 17/01071/FUL, dated 10 May 2017, 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: 1/1250 location plan, Site Plan dated 5/5/17 and elevations drawing.

Main Issue

2. This is the effect of the development upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises a two-storey, semi-detached dwelling located on the north side of Main Street. The dwelling is set back generously from the road behind a brick wall, established hedge and a large, rectangular front garden. The surrounding area is residential in nature and characterised by properties of varying styles and age set out in a linear pattern along Main Street.
4. At the time of my visit I saw that whilst buildings tend to share a common relationship with the road, there is little uniformity in the set back of buildings. I also noted that the modern houses to the east have projecting double garages. The area is not subject to any special designation and although there are some attractive buildings nearby the area has a mixed character. Consequently and notwithstanding the comments of the Council's Conservation

and Design Officer, I do not find anything inherently sensitive about the appeal site or its surrounds that would preclude the principle of new development.

5. Even if I am wrong about that, planning permission has already been granted for a double garage to the front of No 45. As this represents a viable fall-back scheme, it is a consideration of significant weight. The appeal scheme merely seeks to re-site the same garage away from the shared boundary with No 47 and slightly closer to Main Street.
6. The front garden of No 45 is well screened from Main Street by the wall and established hedge which wraps around the vehicular access. The garage would be substantially enclosed on two sides by the hedge. Views from the east would be further screened by a mature pine tree. As a result, I consider that the re-siting of the garage would be imperceptible in the vast majority of public views.
7. I accept that the upper portions of the garage might be visible over the top of the hedge. I also accept that there would be some change to the setting of the host property. However, that would be the case in the approved scheme and overall the garage would still be a fairly inconspicuous addition to the front garden of No 45 in an area where there is no discernible building line. I have considered the argument that the building would harm the openness of the front garden. However, having compared the previous and proposed drawings, it is difficult to understand how the Council came to that view. In my view the reverse would be true. In any event, any loss of openness would not be apparent outside the boundaries of the appeal site. Thus it would not harm the character of the area or the street scene.
8. Based on the site context set out above and the very minor changes proposed, I simply cannot agree that the garage would be dominant, incongruous or injurious to the street scene. There would therefore be no significant harm to the character and appearance of the area or the setting of the host dwelling. Accordingly, there would be no conflict with Policy 10 of the "*Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy 2014*", Policy GP2 d) of the "*Rushcliffe Borough Non-Statutory Replacement Local Plan 2006*" or paragraph 64 of the "*National Planning Policy Framework*". Collectively these seek to ensure that new development is of an appropriate design and reinforces valued local characteristics.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above and taking into account all other matters, I conclude that the appeal should succeed.

D. M. Young

Inspector