



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 1 June 2021

by A Caines BSc(Hons) MSc TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7 June 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/Y2003/D/21/3269309

1 Baildon Road, Scunthorpe DN15 8BU

- 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 Verne Cranston against the decision of North Lincolnshire Council.
 - The application Ref PA/2020/1852, dated 17 November 2020, was refused by notice dated 21 January 2021.
 - The development proposed is a replacement garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a replacement garage at 1 Baildon Road, Scunthorpe DN15 8BU, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref PA/2020/1852, dated 17 November 2020, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not 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: dwg. no 1106 01.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area; and upon the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties, with particular regard to outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal site is a two-storey, semi-detached house with a driveway to the side providing access to a detached garage located in the rear garden. The surrounding area is a typical residential environment where garages, sheds and other outbuildings of various shapes, size and materials are common features within gardens.
4. The garage would have a steep pitched roof to accommodate a first floor storage area, and as a result, would be markedly higher than the existing garage. However, it would not appear overly large for the plot, or in relation to the larger houses and the varied size and character of outbuildings it would be seen in wider context with. Furthermore, as the garage would sit deep within the plot, it would not appear intrusive in the streetscene. Overall, the proposal would not be unduly conspicuous and would have limited impact on the character of this suburban residential locality.

5. I therefore conclude, on this issue, that the development would not harm the character or appearance of the area. Thus, the proposal complies with Policy CS5 of the North Lincolnshire Core Strategy 2011 (the CS) and saved Policy DS5 of the North Lincolnshire Local Plan 2003 (LP), which among other things, require that development is appropriate to its context, and sympathetic in design, scale and materials to the existing dwelling and its neighbours. In this regard, the proposal also complies with the good design aims of paragraph 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework).

Living conditions

6. The garage would be positioned close to the western boundary and at a slightly higher level than the neighbouring properties 84, 86 and 88 Dewsbury Avenue. However, the outlook of each of those neighbouring properties is already significantly affected by their own outbuildings. Also, the main outlook of No 84 is to the south and east rather than towards the appeal site. In addition, the length of the garage would not be excessive along the boundary and its roof would slope away from the boundary. Thus, even taking into account the difference in ground level, I am satisfied that the scale and massing of the garage would not have an overbearing impact on the rear outlook of Nos 84, 86 and 88.
7. There is no suggestion from the Council that the development would impact on No 11 Baildon Road, which also abuts the appeal site, and I have no reason to disagree.
8. I therefore conclude, on this issue, that the development would not harm the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties, with particular regard to outlook. Thus, the proposal complies with LP Policy DS5, which among other things, requires that development is not overbearing to adjacent dwellings. In this regard, the proposal also complies with paragraph 127 (f) of the Framework.

Conditions

9. As suggested by the Council in the appeal Questionnaire, I have imposed the standard commencement and approved plans conditions for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning. However, there is no need for a materials condition as they are specified on the plans.

Conclusion

10. There are no material considerations that indicate the application should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, for the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

A Caines

INSPECTOR