
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 March 2021

by Diane Cragg DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19th March 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/C1055/W/20/3264527

15 Strathmore Avenue, Derby City DE24 0FX

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Stephen Horrocks against the decision of Derby City Council.
 - The application Ref 20/00128/OUT, dated 28 January 2020, was refused by notice dated 1 August 2020.
 - The development proposed is outline planning application for the construction of a detached dwelling along with associated access.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural matters

2. The appeal scheme relates to an outline proposal, with access to be considered at this stage, and with all other matters reserved for future consideration. I have considered the appeal accordingly. A plan has been submitted as part of the appeal which indicates how a dwelling could be accommodated on the site. I have taken this plan into account for indicative purposes only.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. No 15 Strathmore Avenue is a semi-detached house on a corner plot close to the junction of Strathmore Avenue with Anthony Drive. The appeal property has a long rear garden, with side boundary adjoining Anthony Drive. No 15 has been extended towards Anthony Drive with a flat roofed single storey side extension. Within the rear garden, at the back of the plot, there is a detached garage.
5. Anthony Drive is largely characterised by semi-detached houses. Nevertheless, there are other dwelling types within the estate including close to the appeal site where there is a row of terraced properties opposite the site and a detached house adjacent to it. Even so, within the street properties are generally two storeys, mainly set close together and follow a similar building line set back from the road with gardens and parking to the road frontage.
6. The indicative layout plan illustrates how a detached bungalow could be sited within the plot. The application supporting statement also refers to a bungalow.

Bungalows are not a significant feature of the immediate area but there is sufficient variety within the street scene for a property of different proportions to be visually acceptable in the street. Nevertheless, the layout plan illustrates that it would not be possible to accommodate a dwelling without the property projecting significantly forward of the general position of buildings with a frontage to Anthony Drive because of the limited width of the garden.

7. Based on the illustrative plan I consider that the forward projection of the dwelling would result in a highly prominent development that would be an incongruous feature of the street scene.
8. I appreciate that the flat roofed garage at No 15 breaks the general line of properties in Anthony Drive but No 15 forms part of the Strathmore Avenue street frontage, whereas, the proposed dwelling is orientated to form part of the street scene along Anthony Drive.
9. I also note that the Council refers to the proposed dwelling appearing 'cramped' in its plot. I am satisfied that there would be sufficient space between the allocated garden of No 15 and the side of the detached property to the north west for this not to be the case. However, this does not overcome my concern about the proximity of the dwelling to the site frontage.
10. Overall, it has not been demonstrated that it would be possible to site a detached dwelling within the appeal site without appearing incongruous with the general positioning of buildings along Anthony Drive where broadly the properties follow a similar building line even if there are various sizes and styles of dwellings within the street. The forward projection of the dwelling, even at a relatively small scale, would be a prominent and discordant element of the street scene.
11. Consequently, I conclude that the proposal would detract from the character and appearance of the area in conflict with Policies CP3 and CP4 of the Derby City Local Plan: Part 1 – Core Strategy January 2017 and Policy H13 of the adopted City of Derby Local Plan Review which together seek to ensure development is suitable in relation to neighbouring buildings and the local area. It would also conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework where it seeks to ensure that development is sympathetic to local character.

Other Matters

12. I have not been provided with the full details of the application at Rowley Gardens, Littleover and I am unable to draw any comparisons with the appeal proposal. However, the main issue in this appeal is largely determined by the character of the sites immediate surroundings. Therefore, development in another place is not relevant to my consideration of the appeal scheme.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, the proposal would conflict with the development plan and there are no material considerations that would outweigh that conflict. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

Diane Cragg

INSPECTOR