



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 September 2024 by T Morris BA (Hons) MSc

Decision by M Russell BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 October 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/P3040/D/24/3346885

21 Exbury Gardens, West Bridgford, Nottingham NG2 7SL

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Steve Grice against the decision of Rushcliffe Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/00471/FUL.
 - The development proposed is described as 'Construction of double detached garage on frontage land forming part of the host dwelling to include hedge / screening'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector 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 proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. 21 Exbury Gardens (No 21) is a detached dwelling located on a cul-de-sac within a residential area known as the Compton Acres Estate. The cul-de-sac is characterised by detached dwellings which are set back from the street behind front gardens and driveways. Most of these are served by integral or attached garages. There are two detached garages on Exbury Gardens both of which have a discreet presence due to their set back position within the street scene. No 21 features a hard surfaced driveway to the front of the dwelling. Forward of this is the proposed development site which comprises an area of grass, partly bound by bushes. This adjoins a wider area of public open space. Consequently, the proposed development site currently integrates well with the spacious and verdant environs of Exbury Gardens.
5. I acknowledge that the appeal site is within the appellant's ownership and is not part of the adjacent public open space. Even so, the detached double garage would be substantial in form. It would be prominently sited away from the front elevation of the host dwelling and to the other side of its driveway. As a result, it would appear at odds with the established street pattern along

Exbury Gardens and would unacceptably intrude upon the spacious environs of this part of the estate.

6. As illustrated on the proposed street scene, the proposed new hedge planting would only align with one side of the garage and would need to reach a substantial height to fully screen that elevation. A condition requiring a detailed planting scheme would not assimilate the building into its surroundings in views from the road on Exbury Gardens as the orientation of the garage doors and the 'new tarmacked access and parking area' to the front of them would preclude any substantial planting being undertaken to that side of the building.
7. My attention has been drawn to examples of garages on other roads in the area. None of these are seen in the immediate context of Exbury Gardens. The closest is at 47 Acorn Bank and its relative alignment to other dwellings on that street ensures that it is not overly prominent within the street scene. The other examples provided, mainly appear to be sited closer to their associated dwellings. Overall, the examples referred to do not justify the conspicuous siting of the appeal proposal and the harm that would result to the character and appearance of Exbury Gardens.
8. On my site visit I also saw that the frontage of 23 Exbury Gardens (No 23) which sits adjacent to the site is hard surfaced and is separated from the adjacent open green space by a hedgerow. Even so, the frontage of No 23 is devoid of any substantial buildings. As a result, when viewed from the cul-de-sac and from the adjacent open space, the frontage of No 23 retains an overriding spaciousness and a green character through its boundary planting. The frontage of No 23 does not therefore justify the proposed development.
9. I conclude, the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. It would conflict with Policy 10 (Design and Enhancing Local Identity) of the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy (2014) and Policy 1 (Development Requirements) of the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies (2019), which require that development has regard to local context and should make a positive contribution to the public realm and sense of place, reinforce valued local characteristics and be sympathetic to the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
10. Furthermore, the proposal would conflict with Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which seeks to ensure that developments add to the overall quality of the area, are sympathetic to local character and maintain a strong sense of place.

Other Matters

11. The Council's reason for refusal also states that the proposal would make it hard to resist applications for further development on other green spaces in the area. Whether or not that be the case, I have considered the proposed development on its own merits, and it would be harmful for the site-specific reasons described.
12. Even if the existing single garage is too small to be used for parking, this does not justify the provision of the proposed double detached garage given the resultant harm to the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion and Recommendation

13. For the reasons given above, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed since it would conflict with the development plan.

T Morris

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

14. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

M Russell

INSPECTOR