The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 January 2022 by Darren Ellis MPlan

Decision by David M H Rose BA (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/P1045/D/21/3285914
34 Steeple Grange, Wirksworth DE4 4FS

- 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 Clive Stone against the decision of Derbyshire Dales District Council.
- The application 21/01027/FUL, dated 11 August 2021, was refused by notice dated 26 October 2021.
- The development proposed is a new Lidget compton highliner garage to house a motorhome & classic car.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the existing dwellinghouse and its surroundings, and on the living conditions of the occupiers of 24A Steeple Grange with particular regard to visual impact and overshadowing.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Character and appearance

4. The appeal property is a detached two-storey dwelling set in a generous plot to the rear of 32 Steeple Grange. The site also houses an existing detached garage and a timber shed. The site is within a predominantly residential area, with a dental practice and other residential properties adjacent to the site. The properties in the immediate area are finished with a range of materials including brick, stone and render. Overall this has resulted in an attractive residential environment.

5. The existing shed would be replaced with a second detached garage. The existing garage is constructed of pebbledash and metal sheets, which is out of character with the surrounding properties. The proposed garage would be considerably larger than the existing garage and would be constructed of the same materials. Due to its scale, form and materials, the proposed garage

would have an industrial character and appearance that would be at odds with the surrounding residential environment. An alteration of the colour of the roof sheets would not alter the industrial appearance of the garage.

6. Although the property is set behind the properties that front onto Steeple Grange, both garages would be positioned at the head of the driveway from Steeple Grange and as such would be directly visible from the street, which would increase the prominence of the garages.

7. For these reasons the proposal would not respond well to its context and would detract from the character and appearance of the existing dwellinghouse and its surroundings. The proposal would therefore conflict with policies PD1 and HC10 of the Adopted Derbyshire Dales Local Plan (December 2017) (LP) which require, amongst other things, that development including outbuildings are of high-quality design and that the scale, form and materials are in keeping with the original and adjacent buildings and the character of the area.

Living conditions of the occupiers of 24A Steeple Grange

8. The proposed garage would be positioned adjacent to the boundary with No 24A and in close proximity to the side elevation of that dwelling. The appeal site is at a lower land level than No 24A and as such the proposal would not have a significant impact on the first-floor side window at No 24A. However, the garage would be close to three ground-floor windows and a side door. It is not clear which rooms the windows and door serve or whether those rooms are served by additional windows on other elevations. Nevertheless, the close proximity of the garage together with its scale, despite the difference in land levels, would severely reduce the outlook from these side windows and the door and as such the garage would have a considerable overbearing impact on No 24A. Furthermore, as the garage would be to the west of No 24A there would be significant overshadowing of these windows and the door during the late afternoon and evening hours.

9. The appellant states that the gables could be oriented north-south if required. However, this would result in the ridge running parallel to the boundary with No 24A, resulting in an effective increase in ridge height along this boundary which would exacerbate the overbearing impact and overshadowing identified above.

10. Whilst the current occupier of No 24A may not have any objection to the appeal proposal, I am required to consider the likely effect on existing and future neighbours of the property. Despite the lack of objection from the present neighbours the proposal would have an unacceptable impact for the reasons given above.

11. For these reasons, the proposal would cause harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of 24A Steeple Grange. Consequently, the proposal would fail to accord with LP policy PD1 which requires, amongst other things, for development to achieve a satisfactory relationship to adjacent properties and not to cause an unacceptable overbearing impact or overshadowing.

Other Matters

12. The appellant states that the area is littered with similar structures. However, it is not known if the context of these other structures is the same as the appeal proposal with regards to the scale of the building and its position relative to the

neighbouring properties. As such I cannot be certain that any of these other structures are directly comparable to the scheme before me.

13. I recognise that the proposal would provide storage facilities for the appellant's motorhome and classic cars. Whilst I give some weight to this benefit this does not outweigh the conflict with planning policies identified in relation to the main issues.

Conclusion and recommendation

14. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed because of the conflict with the development plan and there being no material considerations which indicate that a decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan.

Darren Ellis

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

15. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and, on that basis, I agree with the recommendation and shall dismiss the appeal.

David MH Rose

INSPECTOR