
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 May 2017

by Y Wright BSc (Hons) DipTP MSc DMS MRTPI

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

Decision date: 5 June 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/G1630/D/17/3171385

46 Vale Road, Bishops Cleeve, Cheltenham GL52 8ER

- 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 Chris Johnson against the decision of Tewkesbury Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 16/01288/FUL, dated 9 November 2016, was refused by notice dated 1 February 2017.
 - The development proposed is described as 'This proposal is in respect of 46 Vale Road, a brand new house being built as part of a development by Taylor Wimpey Homes. The application is in respect of a proposal to erect a single garage on the current hard standing allocated for car parking for this property. The garage will be built with the same materials as all the other garages in the immediate vicinity. The area in which the garage is proposed to be built is currently undergoing a large housing project being undertaken by Taylor Wimpey Homes. The garage will conform to the same look and style as the garages being built on this Taylor Wimpey housing development'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises a hardstanding for two vehicles situated on a modern residential estate and accessed directly off Vale Road. The land opposite the site to the north is currently under construction. To the south and west is an area of public open space and beyond there is further residential development. Also to the west is a substation building. The proposal would involve the construction of a single detached garage on the rear tandem parking space.
 4. I saw on my site visit that garages within the area are set much further back from the highway than the dwellings and are mainly located adjacent to and between properties. As such they are not visibly prominent within the street scene.
 5. By comparison, whilst the proposed garage would be set back from the road, it would be located immediately in front of the public open green space and away from the main property on the opposite side of a wide public footpath. It would therefore appear as a prominent structure significantly divorced from the host
-

dwelling which would be out of keeping with the pattern of development within the area. Furthermore the introduction of a built structure onto the site would materially harm the existing spacious character of the surrounding open space. In this regard I am mindful that the National Planning Policy Framework places great importance on development being of good design and responding to local character to ensure the integration of new development into the existing environment.

6. I have taken into consideration that the design of the garage in relation to the roof type and use of construction materials would reflect that of the host dwelling. Nevertheless the pitch of the roof would generally not be in keeping with those of other garages I saw within the locality. Whilst I also note that the existing substation is visually prominent within the street scene this in itself would not justify harmful development. In any case each proposal must be considered on its own individual merits.
7. Taking all the above factors into account, I consider that the development, due to its overall design, prominent location and separation from the main dwelling, would result in an incongruous addition to the street scene which would have a significantly adverse impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding area. It would therefore be contrary to Policy HOU8 of the Tewksbury Borough Local Plan to 2011 (2006) which seeks, amongst other things, domestic extensions that respect the character and appearance of the property and surrounding area. The proposal would therefore not constitute sustainable development and would also conflict with the Framework.
8. In reaching my conclusion I have taken account of the benefits that the development would bring to the Appellant in order to enhance his family home and provide secure parking. However I can only give these personal benefits little weight, since it would be likely that the new development would be in place long after the personal circumstances have ceased to apply. As such this does not outweigh the harm I have found on the main issue.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above and having considered all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Y Wright

INSPECTOR