



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 March 2025

by Mrs Chris Pipe BA(Hons), DipTP, MTP, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/C1055/D/25/3359480

423 Boulton Lane Derby DE24 9DL

- 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 Alison Henchliffe against the decision of Derby City Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/01611/FUL.
 - The development proposed is erection of a sectional garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The site is located within a predominantly residential area where property designs vary. I observed during my site visit that there were a few garages located to the front of plots within the area, however these were not common.
4. The appeal site property is set back on the plot in comparison to the adjacent property No. 421 Boulton Lane as such the proposed development would be screened to a degree by the adjacent property. I also observed that a large trailer parked adjacent the appeal site at No. 425 which again would provide limited screening.
5. Nevertheless, the trailer is moveable and whilst the adjacent property No. 421 is set forward the proposed development would be obvious and incongruous in the streetscene. I find that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the area.
6. There is conflict with saved Policies CP3 and CP4 of the Derby City Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy (2017) which seek amongst other things to ensure developments are well designed responding to their context.
7. There is also conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework (2024) which seeks to ensure developments are of good design appropriate and sympathetic to their surroundings.

Other Matters

8. The appellant has highlighted that the proposed development is required due to the personal circumstances, to cover a classic car. I have not been provided with substantive evidence to demonstrate that the proposed development would be the only way to fulfil the needs of the appellant. Notwithstanding this the covering of a classic car would not outweigh the harm I have identified about.

Conclusion

9. For the above reasons I conclude that this appeal should be dismissed.

Chris Pipe

INSPECTOR