



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 December 2020

by K Ford MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 December 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/F1040/D/20/3261168

Burbage, Etwall Lane, Burnaston, Derby DE65 6LF

- 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 Michael Taplin against the decision of South Derbyshire District Council.
 - The application Ref DMPA/2020/0420, dated 27 April 2020, was refused by notice dated 24 July 2020.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a detached garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site sits in a short row of variously styled detached dwellings set back from the grass verge and road behind driveways and gardens creating a fairly consistent linear building line.
4. The proposed garage would be sited to the front of the dwelling breaking the building line. It would be of a size and scale that would create a discordant addition to the street scene, especially given its location in close proximity to the highway. This is despite the presence of the grass verge. The position of the garage behind the existing boundary wall would do little to mitigate the harm given the height of the wall in relation to the garage. Nor would design features such as the roof pitch and the absence of any windows on the elevation facing the road.
5. The appellant has referenced other developments in the village to support their case. The examples in Main Street are located away from the site where I consider the character to be different. Whilst there are 2 outbuildings adjacent to each other in front of the building line in Etwall Lane, they are on the opposite side of the road. I do not know the circumstances in which these buildings were granted planning permission. However, their presence detracts from the otherwise open nature of the area and as such do not weigh in favour of the scheme. In any event, each case is determined on its own merits and my assessment is based on the evidence before me.

6. The scheme would harm the character and appearance of the area. The fact that the site is not located in a Conservation Area does not alter my view on this matter. It would consequently conflict with the part of Policy SD1 of the South Derbyshire Local Plan Part 1 (Local Plan) which supports development that would not lead to adverse impacts on the environment. It would also conflict with Policy H27 and Policy BNE1 of the Local Plan which among other things supports the erection of outbuildings where they are not detrimental to the character and appearance of the area and requires new development to respond to its context, be appropriate and contribute to achieving continuity within the street scene. There would also be conflict with the relevant parts of the South Derbyshire Design Guide relating to local character.

Other Matters

7. The appellant has identified that there would be no harm to the living conditions of neighbouring occupants. However, this would not outweigh the harm to the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons identified, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

K Ford

INSPECTOR