



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 October 2012

by **John G Millard DipArch RIBA FCI Arb**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 24 October 2012

Appeal Ref: APP/Y2003/D/12/2183234

Fairholme, Elm Lane, Goxhill, North Lincolnshire DN19 7JU

- 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 Garry Tanner against the decision of North Lincolnshire Council.
 - The application Ref: PA/2012/0795 was refused by notice dated 21 August 2012.
 - The development proposed is described as erect a garage to the front of the property and replace garage door with windows. This is an amendment to approved planning permission PA/2012/0307 and covers a garage unit set back from the property boundary and includes a hedge screen.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The description of development given on the application form and repeated above refers to a previous grant of planning permission for a garage at the front of the house. I have not, however, had sight of the approved scheme and have determined the proposal before me on its merits and in accordance with relevant national and local planning policies as I am, in any event, required to do.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a detached two storey dwellinghouse within a cluster of bungalows and 2-storey houses towards the western end of Elm Lane, close to its junction with Ferry Road. The lane is semi-rural in character with, for the most part, but with one or two notable exceptions, dwellings set well back from the highway boundary with good size front gardens and, in many cases, mature front boundary hedges. I noted at the site visit that a vacant parcel of land on the opposite side of Elm Lane, directly facing the appeal site, was in the process
-

of being developed but I have no information as to the nature of that development.

5. I also saw at the site visit that the alterations to the front of the appeal property, referred to in the description of development, had been carried out so that only the proposed garage remains outstanding. This would be positioned close to the front boundary, behind a new hedge, and would measure some 5.0 x 5.6 metres on plan, with eaves and ridge heights that I estimate would be around 2.25 metres and 4.35 metres respectively. The barn hipped roof would be covered with interlocking clay tiles to match those on the main house whilst the walls would be of red brickwork, again to match the house. The existing boundary hedge and an associated tree would be removed to create a new access.
6. In the location proposed the garage would be largely screened from view on the approach from Ferry Road by a cluster of established evergreen trees but in views from other directions it would be seen above and around the proposed boundary hedge as a prominent and visually intrusive feature within the street scene. Although there is no consistent building line within this cluster of dwellings, or indeed in the lane as a whole, the established pattern of development is one of buildings positioned well back within their plots, with front boundaries either left open or defined by hedges. It is these features which help to create the attractive open and semi-rural character of the lane.
7. In its recently published National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) the Government focuses on the importance of good design, an objective that is also sought by Policy DS1 of the adopted North Lincolnshire Local Plan 2003 (LP). In this regard paragraph 56 of the Framework notes that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development whilst criterion (vii) of the LP Policy seeks the retention of existing site features that contribute to the character or amenity of the site or surrounding area. The absence of built development close to the highway boundary at Fairholme is a feature that clearly contributes to the character of the area and it is my view that erecting a garage in the location proposed would significantly diminish that contribution.
8. In support of the proposal the appellant has directed me to a nearby dwelling, 'Carmel', which is located on the opposite side of the lane, a little to the west, and has a detached garage forward of the dwelling. In that case, however, both the garage and the dwelling are set further into the site than would be the case at Fairholme, in addition to which the flat roofed garage is more diminutive in scale and unassuming in its appearance than that proposed at the appeal property. Accordingly, both its impact on the street scene and its weight in support of the appeal proposal are minimal.
9. My attention has also been drawn to situations further afield where detached garages comparable to or larger than that proposed at Fairholme are said to have been permitted by the Council. These are located in Thorn Lane and Stothards Lane, some distance to the south of the appeal property, and I saw at the site visit that, whilst the locations are no less rural, the patterns of development in the streets concerned are more varied than that in Elm Lane. Furthermore, as I have no information as to when and in what circumstances permission was granted for these developments, I find that they do not weigh heavily in support of the appeal proposal.

10. For the above reasons I am drawn to the conclusion that, because of its position close to the highway boundary and its consequent visual impact on the street scene, the proposed garage would cause material harm to the character and appearance of the area, in conflict with LP Policy DC1 and Framework objectives. In reaching this conclusion I have considered all other matters raised but found nothing that changes the balance of my decision that the appeal should be dismissed.

John G Millard

INSPECTOR