

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 November 2016

by G Powys Jones MSc FRTPI

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

Decision date: 07 December 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/J3720/D/16/3161067

Cheverney, Ilmington Road, Blackwell, Shipston-on-Stour, Warwickshire, CV36 4PG

- 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 Neil Plumb against the decision of Stratford-on-Avon District Council.
 - The application Ref 16/01899/FUL, dated 5 June 2016, was refused by notice dated 6 September 2016.
 - The development proposed is a double garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary matter

2. The applicant's Christian name is spelt '*Niel*' and the appeal property is spelt '*Cheverny*' in the application form, whereas in the appeal form they are spelt differently - as '*Neil*' and '*Cheverney*' respectively. Since they appear to be the correct forms, I have used the latter in the banner heading above.

Main issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the host property and its surroundings.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is one of several detached properties laid out in a row on a common building line aside a country lane leading out of the village, adjacent to open fields and countryside. Most of the other dwellings have garages, either integral or detached. The appeal property is without one, and since the house fills virtually the full width of the plot to its side boundaries and there is no rear access, the appellant proposes the erection of a garage to the front of the property.
 5. The design of the double garage, with rendered concrete block walls and a flat roof, is what I would describe as extremely utilitarian. Its size and appearance would render it incongruous in its proposed position to the front of the dwelling, harming the character of the dwelling and its surroundings. Whilst a low hedge is in situ to the front of the site, the garage would nevertheless be clearly seen and highly noticeable to passers-by from the lane outside.
-

6. I therefore share the views expressed by the Council and Parish Council as to the appropriateness of the proposal and conclude that it would harm the character or appearance of the host property and the largely rural surroundings. Accordingly, a clear conflict arises with those provisions of policies CS.5 & CS.9 of the Stratford-on-Avon District Local Core Strategy designed to protect the landscape and settlements from the harmful effects of poor design.

Other matters

7. The appellant's brief grounds of appeal have been taken into account, and these concentrate on other forms of development approved nearby by the Council, which in the appellant's view have a greater impact. I do not have the full details of the development referred to by the appellant, and I can therefore attach little weight to this point. In any event, I have found the proposal objectionable on its merits, for the reasons already stated.
8. All other matters raised in the representations have been taken into account, including the appellant's point that his neighbours have not objected, but none are of such strength or significance as to outweigh the considerations that led me to my conclusions.

G Powys Jones

INSPECTOR