



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 October 2023

by Paul Cooper MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24th October 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/C1055/D/23/3327998

11 Oakridge, Derby DE21 4RB

- 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 & Mrs Binnion against the decision of Derby City Council.
 - The application Ref 23/0697/FUL, dated 18 May 2023, was refused by notice dated 6 July 2023.
 - The development proposed is demolition of existing detached garage and proposed new detached garage.
-

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 locality.

Reasons

3. The host property is a detached bungalow on a cul-de-sac of similar properties. The area is predominately residential in nature. There is a grassed area to the front of the property, across the driveway, which is open to Oakridge. A single garage is located in that area.
4. The appeal proposal seeks to remove the existing garage and erect a new double garage, built in materials to match the surrounding dwellings. It would be located on the grassed area, in a similar location to the existing garage. Access to the garage would be taken from the driveway of the host property. The proposal would be approximately 6.8m x 6.4m to a height of 2.7m.
5. I find that the larger garage in that location would look extremely prominent and incongruous within the locality, effectively creating a structure that would look somewhat isolated in the area with the layout of the bungalows as existing and would cause harm to the ordered pattern of development, causing material harm to the character and appearance of the locality.
6. I have noted the comments of the appellant with regard to other similar development in the area. I have limited details as to the nature of these schemes, their context and planning status. In any event, I must assess the proposal on its own merits, and I have identified harm accordingly.

7. I find that the appeal proposal is in conflict with policies CP3 and CP4 of the Derby City Local Plan Part 1 Core Strategy (2017) and Saved Policy H16 of the City of Derby Local Plan Review (2006), which, amongst other matters, expects development to respect building form, scale, massing, siting and setting and not create an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the streetscene in terms of visual prominence.

Conclusion

8. The proposal does not accord with the development plan as a whole and there are no other considerations, including the Framework, that indicate I should take a different decision other than in accordance with this.
9. For the reasons outlined above, I conclude the appeal should be dismissed.

Paul Cooper

INSPECTOR