
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 February 2020

by Peter Mark Sturgess BSc (Hons), MBA, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State.

Decision date: 18th March 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/J3015/D/19/3238850

11 Edale Rise, Toton, Nottingham, NG9 6JJ

- 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 Steven Marriott against the decision of Broxtowe Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 19/00330/FUL, dated 6 June 2019, was refused by notice dated 31 July 2019.
 - The development proposed is to erect a single storey detached garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission granted for the erection of a single storey detached garage at 11 Edale Rise, Toton, Nottingham, NG9 6JJ, in accordance with application reference 19/00330/FUL, dated 6 June 2019, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin no 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: proposed block plan dated 4 June 2019; proposed elevations dated 30 July 2019; location plan, dated received by Broxtowe Borough Council Planning Services 6 June 2019.
 - 3) No above ground development shall take place until the details of the finishes, including colour and texture, of all external materials have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The relevant works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Main Issues

2. The effect of the proposed garage on the character and appearance of Edale Rise.

Reasons

3. The development plan for the area is the Greater Nottingham Aligned Core Strategy – Local Plan Part 1 (GNACS), adopted in 2014 and the Local Plan Part 2 (LPP2), adopted in October 2019. The LPP2 was adopted after the decision on this planning application and supersedes the Broxtowe Local Plan of 2004. I have therefore had regard to the current development plan GNACS and the LPP2 in determining this appeal.

4. The development plan seeks to ensure new developments integrate with their surroundings and make a positive contribution to their areas. The LPP2, at paragraph 4 of Policy 17, refers to householder developments being sited and designed to make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area, not dominating the existing building or appearing over prominent in the street scene.
5. The established pattern of residential development in Edale Drive is not uniform. Dwellings and garden buildings are at different distances from the highway and this adds interest to the area and is an element that contributes to its character. The proposed garage would reflect the existing pattern of development and hence would not appear discordant in terms of siting, massing and scale. It would have a pitched roof and be capable of being finished in materials that match the existing house and the boundary wall.
6. There is a levels difference between Edale Drive and the site of the proposed garage, with the garage site lower than Edale Drive. The view of the garage in the street scene would therefore be limited. Although its roof and the upper part of its flank and end walls would be visible from outside the site these features would not be prominent nor incongruous in the street scene, as visibility would be limited by the surrounding boundary wall and the change in levels. The wider back drop of the main dwelling would mean that the garage would be read in the context of the main dwelling and not as an independent, stand alone, building. I consider that the garage will make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area, provided its external finishes are controlled.
7. I find the proposal is in accordance with the development plan, the GNACS and the LPP2, as it would make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area, help reinforce local characteristics and be subservient to the main dwelling.

Conditions

8. In addition to the time limit condition and a condition referencing the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt, I consider it necessary, given the visibility of part of the garage in the street scene to control the final finishes of the building in order to protect the character and appearance of the area. I have therefore included a condition to ensure that this happens.

Conclusion

9. I find that having regard to all matters before me, including the policies of the development plan, when taken as a whole, the appeal should be allowed, and planning permission granted.

Peter Mark Sturgess

INSPECTOR