



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 February 2020

by Robert Hitchcock BSc DipCD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 February 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/P3040/D/19/3240528

The Hedgerows, Sutton Lane, Granby NG13 9PY

- 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 J Wilson against the decision of Rushcliffe Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 19/02071/FUL, dated 2 September 2019, was refused by notice dated 29 October 2019.
 - The development proposed is to erect a double garage with studio room above. Along with replacing old electric gates with a new cantilever gate. The works will require some tree and hedge trimming and removal. Done only sufficient to create new works.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Application for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Mr J Wilson against Rushcliffe Borough Council. This application is the subject of a separate decision.

Main Issues

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed building on the character and appearance of the locality and whether it would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Granby Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

4. Granby is a small historic rural village surrounded by open countryside. The village centres on a C13 church and historic nucleus of a tight cluster of irregularly sited early farmsteads, cottages and townhouses about small greens. The village has seen stages of later infill development and planned expansions to its outer edges. The significance of the village derives from its compact nucleated form, its elevated historic setting within the agricultural landscape and the variation and quality of its buildings set within an attractive rural townscape.
5. The appeal site lies adjacent to the Old Vicarage and forms an element of a planned C20 village extension where properties are generally set behind hedges and modest front gardens. The area has an open verdant character on account of the set-back positions of the buildings; the limited height of bungalows on the opposite side of the road; and, the soft roadside verges, vegetated boundaries and frontage trees.

6. The appeal site accommodates an extended modern detached dwelling set within established gardens. The front boundary is formed of a mature hedge, open timber fencing and a semi-mature tree.
7. The proposed position of the garage would sit forward of the existing dwelling close to the roadside hedge. This would reflect other instances of garage buildings and extensions visible elsewhere on the lane. Furthermore, the design and appearance, including the use of materials to match the dwelling, would be consistent with the style of ancillary buildings found locally.
8. However, in contrast to other examples, the scale of the building arising from its large footprint, long high ridgeline and incorporation of a dormer projection, would have a considerable visual bulk that would be highly visible in the street frontage. Despite the existing hedges within the site, the building would be prominent and stand out as an imposing and obtrusive feature that, by virtue of its height and positioning, would undermine the open rural character of this part of the lane.
9. Of the local examples of garage development referred to me by the appellant, I noted that those sited close to the road frontage were lower in height than the proposed development. Furthermore, they were set lower or further back as to benefit from existing vegetation screening and retained the sense of openness.
10. An example of a similarly designed garage at Bunny Cottage was observed to be recessed behind the line of that dwelling. This lay within the historic core of the village where development is less regimented in its arrangement and therefore displays different characteristics to that part of Sutton Lane where the development is proposed. Moreover, the existence of development elsewhere does not represent an appropriate reason to find in favour of a proposal that I have identified would cause harm.
11. Under the duty imposed under s72(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 I am required to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the CA. For the reasons set out above, and notwithstanding the proposal to use materials to match the existing dwelling, I conclude that the development would cause harm to the open rural character and appearance of this part of the townscape and CA.
12. Whilst this harm would be no greater than less than substantial within the context of Paragraph 196 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), less than substantial harm does not equate to a less than substantial planning objection. As that harm would not be outweighed by any public benefits of the scheme the development would conflict with Policies 10 and 11 of the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy (2014) and the Framework as they seek to achieve designs that enhance local identity and conserve or enhance the historic environment and their settings.

Conclusion

13. For the above reasons, the appeal should be dismissed.

R Hitchcock INSPECTOR