



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 June 2021

by Paul Cooper MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8 June 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/B3030/D/21/3272242

20 Churchfield Drive, Rainworth, Nottinghamshire NG21 0BJ

- 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 Mrs C Carson against the decision of Newark & Sherwood District Council.
 - The application Ref 20/02349/HOUSE, dated 28 November 2020, was refused by notice dated 2 February 2021.
 - The development proposed is erection of a detached double garage after demolition of the existing semi-detached outbuilding and timber shed.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area and the host dwelling.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a single storey dwelling in a predominately residential area of mixed dwelling types. The appeal dwelling is a corner property of the residential cul-de-sac.
4. The appeal proposal would see the erection of a double garage in the front amenity area of the property, with the garage door facing toward the cul-de-sac. It would be located approximately 6.5m from the front windows of the host dwelling. The property currently looks onto a single storey converted car port, used as storage, across the front amenity area.
5. I find the location of the garage would not cause harm to the living conditions of nearby residents, and given its design and materials, would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the area, given its location in the corner of the cul-de-sac, sheltered from the rear by the embankment.
6. The structure would be located at the same site level as the host dwelling. The proximity of such a large structure in close proximity to the front of the dwelling would result in an overbearing sense of enclosure when viewed from the host dwelling.

7. I have taken into account the comments of the appellant in that natural light from the sunlight path would not be materially affected due to the location of the garage, and that the host dwelling obtains considerable natural light from the presence of rooflights in the dwelling in the main front room, but that does not address the potential overbearing impact of the double garage on the host dwelling.
8. I acknowledge that the impact would be experienced by the appellants, who in submitting the proposal are consenting to it. However, I must consider the quality of the living conditions of the existing residents but those of future occupiers too.
9. I understand that the appellants seek to introduce garaging to their property, however I find that in this case I conclude that it would result in unacceptable harm to outlook for existing and future occupiers of the host property by creating an overbearing sense of enclosure.
10. The proposal would therefore conflict with Policy CP9 of the Newark & Sherwood Amended Core Strategy (2019) and policies DM5 and DM6 of the Allocations & Development Management DPD (2013), which, amongst other matters, expect the layout of development to avoid unacceptable reductions in amenity, including overbearing impacts.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons set out above, the appeal is dismissed.

Paul Cooper

INSPECTOR