



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 August 2022

by K Ford MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7 September 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/W3005/W/22/3300624

Land adjacent 129 Wild Hill, Teversal, Nottinghamshire NG17 3JE

- 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 D Skellington against the decision of Ashfield District Council.
 - The application Ref V/2022/0203, dated 12 March 2022, was refused by notice dated 6 May 2022.
 - The development proposed is removal of integral garages to plots one and 3 to create habitable room and 2 detached garages.
-

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 is a rectangular piece of land with planning permission for 3 dwellings located between vacant land and a row of properties in an area designated as countryside. The 5 immediate neighbouring properties closest to the site share a distinct building line which the 3 dwellings with planning permission would continue. The 5 neighbouring properties are set back from the road with driveways and front gardens. The area to the front of the properties is characterised by an absence of built development creating an open spacious character.
4. The proposed detached garages would stand forward of the predominant building line in the immediate vicinity of the site. They would be single storey and constructed of similar materials to the dwellings. However, due to their siting and massing they would create an incongruous addition to the street scene that would not relate well to the existing development. The garages would be highly visible when travelling along Wild Hill with vegetation only providing partial screening.
5. The appellant has referred to other sites on Wild Hill in support of their case, in particular The Bungalow and The Cottage, both of which I observed on my site visit. The Bungalow forms part of a different building line and is physically and visually separated from the appeal site. The Cottage is located on the opposite side of the road where there is also a different building line. Neither example therefore supports the case before me. The appellant also refers to other cases

in different locations where the circumstances will inevitably be different. In any event, each case is determined on its own merits and the case has been assessed on the information before me.

6. The site is not located within a protected landscape but as acknowledged by the appellant, paragraph 174 of the National Planning Policy Framework identifies that planning decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by amongst other things, recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside.
7. Whilst the appellant has suggested possible amendments to the scheme to create a new boundary treatment, the appeal process is not the place to further a scheme. My decision is based on the plans submitted to the Council and on which interested parties have had an opportunity to comment.
8. The proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area and as such would conflict with Policies ST1 and ENV2 of the Ashfield Local Plan Review. Amongst other things, these policies require new development to not adversely affect the character of the environment. It would also conflict with the parts of Policies NP1 and NP2 of the Teversal, Stanton Hill and Skegby Neighbourhood Plan (2016-31) which requires new housing development to demonstrate high quality design and respect existing landscape character and be located and designed so not to adversely affect the character of the countryside.
9. It would also conflict with the part of the Residential Extension Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document which says garages should generally not be sited between the main front elevation of a dwelling and the road or footpath. It is only considered appropriate to site a garage forward of the dwelling where it would not appear unduly prominent in the street scene and it would enhance an already varied street scene.

Other Matters

10. The appellant has identified that the scheme would not harm the living conditions of the occupants of neighbouring properties. Be that as it may, this does not outweigh the harm I have identified to the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

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

K Ford

INSPECTOR