



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 July 2022 by Darren Ellis MPlan

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 01 December 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/C1055/W/22/3291495

129 Hawthorn Street, Derby DE24 8BB

- 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 Aliks Galthans against the decision of Derby City Council. The application Ref 21/01990/FUL, dated 17 November 2021, was refused by notice dated 14 January 2021.
 - The development proposed is a detached 2 bedroom dwelling.
-

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 Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed dwelling on the character and appearance of the street scene.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The dwellings that line either side of Hawthorn Street tend to be older detached and semi-detached examples set back from and facing the street with front gardens and parking to the side. There are some more modern examples, with dormer windows, opposite and extending into Glossop Street which are markedly different. The prevailing building size, layout, design and position on the north side of Hawthorn Street create a pleasant homogeneity to the street scene, forming a clear contrast to the obviously more modern opposite side. Moreover, the gaps between pairs of buildings lend a strong sense of spaciousness. Both factors contribute positively to the character and appearance of the area.
 5. The appeal scheme would introduce a more modern and arguably standardised take on a two-storey detached dwelling into a street scene of older buildings which would, despite taking reference from features around it, appear incongruous and disrupt the original quality of neighbouring pairs. Furthermore, it would infill a defined gap between pairs of buildings, giving the appearance of a cramped form of development which would, consequently, erode the spacious feel of the street scene. In addition, the new dwelling
-

would have hardstanding over the entirety of its frontage to provide off street parking. This would further disrupt the consistency of this side of the street. The addition of some landscaping within the plot would be welcomed and go some way to addressing this but would be, given my other findings, insufficient to make the appeal scheme acceptable.

6. I note that a detached dwelling has recently been constructed at 11 Davenport Road, although no substantive details of the planning permission have been submitted. Nevertheless, No 11 is very similar in design to the terraced properties next to it and as such it integrates successfully into the street scene, which is not the case with the appeal proposal.
7. For these reasons set out above, the proposed dwelling would be an incongruous addition and consequently would detract from the character and appearance of the street scene. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policies CP3 and CP4 of the Derby City Local Plan Part 1 Core Strategy (January 2017) and paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework which all seek, amongst other things, for proposals to have a high-quality design that make a positive contribution towards the character of the dwelling and street scene, including with regards to architectural features.

Other Matters

8. The proposal would provide one additional unit of accommodation and therefore the development would, to a limited degree, boost the supply of housing. This is a benefit of the scheme which carries limited weight in support of the proposal.

Conclusion and recommendation

9. The benefits that would arise from the proposal would not outweigh the harm that would be caused to the character and appearance of the street scene, to which I ascribe substantial weight. There are no material considerations worthy of sufficient weight which indicate that a decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, for the reasons given above, I recommend that the appeal be dismissed.

D Ellis

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

10. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report, and I agree with the recommendation that the appeal should be dismissed.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR