
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 August 2020

by Zoe Raygen Dip URP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14th August 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/N3020/D/20/3253612

16 Kighill Lane, Ravenshead NG15 9HN

- 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 D Skillington against the decision of Gedling Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2020/0249, dated 10 March 2020, was refused by notice dated 11 May 2020.
 - The development proposed is a double garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a double garage at 16 Kighill Lane, Ravenshead NG15 9HN in accordance with the terms of the application, application Ref 2020/0249, dated 10 March 2020 subject to the conditions set out below.
 - 1) The development must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this permission.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plan: VED598 02D
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area.

Reasons

3. The residential properties on Kighill Lane are of various forms and designs creating a mixed character to the street. Notwithstanding this, the houses are mostly set some distance from the road in a fairly uniform, linear form, behind front gardens. Boundary treatment to the road is typically formed from hedges and trees. This, together with the spacious front gardens gives a verdant, open character and appearance to the area.
4. The proposed garage would be set forward of the existing house, close to the front boundary. While this would be forward of the prevailing building line by a significant distance, the garage would be a single storey, modest addition with a hipped roof. Furthermore, it would be sited to one side of the front elevation

of the dwelling allowing views to be retained of No 16 and its garden. As such it would be subservient to the host dwelling. Moreover, it would be mostly screened from view by the existing hedge and tree which would be supplemented by further planting.

5. In addition, I saw two properties along Kighill Road already have garages in a similar position to that proposed at the appeal site. While they are some distance from No 16, the long straight nature of the road means that views along it encompass a number of properties. It is evident that the existing landscaping provides a good screen to these garages so that they are not particularly obtrusive or incongruous in the street scene. I see no reason why this proposal should not be similar and therefore, the verdant open character and appearance of the area would be maintained.
6. I note that the Inspector in dismissing appeal ref APP/N3020/W/19/3222258 for the erection of six dwellings at 22 Kighill Road, was concerned about the position of three of the dwellings forward of the established building line. However, this concern related to three large dwellings of a similar design rather than a modest single storey garage as proposed. Therefore, while the Inspector considered that the breach of the building line harmed a significant part of the local character, I am not persuaded that the scale or massing of that proposal is similar to that before me now.
7. For the reasons above, I conclude that the proposal would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling or the area. There would therefore be no conflict with policy LPD 35 of the Gedling Borough Local Planning Document Part 2 Local Plan 2018 and Policy 10 of the Greater Nottingham Aligned Core Strategies Part 1 Local Plan 2014 and paragraphs 127 and 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). Together these require that development is of a high standard of design that is sympathetic to local character and context and the massing scale and proportion of development should be appropriate to the immediate context.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Conditions

9. I have had regard to the various planning conditions that have been suggested by the Council and considered them against the tests in the Framework and the advice in the Planning Practice Guidance and have made such amendments as necessary to comply with those documents.
10. In the interests of certainty, it is appropriate that there is a condition requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans.
11. A condition regarding materials is necessary to protect the character and appearance of the area.

Zoe Raygen

INSPECTOR