

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 August 2017

by N McGurk BSc (Hons) MCD MBA MRTPI

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

Decision date: 05 September 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Z2830/D/17/3177273

42 Glebe Rise, Kings Sutton, Banbury, OX17 3PH

- 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 Alex Lock against the decision of South Northamptonshire Council.
 - The application Ref S/2017/0550/FUL, dated 11 February 2017, was refused by notice dated 26 April 2017.
 - The development proposed is construction of wooden car port.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The appeal property was extended further to the receipt of planning permission in 2008¹ which included an extension to the rear and a single storey side extension incorporating conversion of the existing garage.

Main Issues

3. The main issues in this case are the effects of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area; and its effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of No 40 Glebe Rise, with regards to outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal property is an extended detached bungalow. It is located at the end of a cul-de-sac in a residential area characterised by a mix of one and two storey dwellings with stone and/or rendered elevations.
5. Dwellings tend to be detached, or have attached single storey garages and are set within comfortable garden plots. The presence of planting, trees and gardens affords the area an attractive green and spacious character. Further, the common use of stone and render results in a sense of uniformity that contributes significantly to the area's attributes.

¹ Ref: Application S/2008/0743/P approved 10/07/2008

6. During my site visit, I observed the appeal property to comprise the end property of three modestly sized bungalows served by an access extending from towards the top of a cul-de-sac along Glebe Rise. Each of the bungalows are set back a short distance from the access road, behind gardens and/or parking areas.
7. There are views along Glebe Rise beyond the end of this access road through to garden land and this makes a significant contribution to the area's attractive qualities of greenery and spaciousness.
8. The proposed garage would provide for the parking of two cars, side-by-side and would reach a height of more than three metres. As such, and relative to the modest size of the appeal dwelling and its neighbours, it would comprise a structure of considerable size. I find that the proposed location of this relatively large structure, at the end of the access road to the three bungalows along this part of Glebe Rise, would result in it appearing prominently in views as one travels along the cul-de-sac. It would also, in part, serve to block existing views over garden land and as such, it would appear as an unduly dominant feature that would detract from the area's open and spacious attributes.
9. The harm arising from the above would be exacerbated by the proposed use of timber. This would result in a structure that would appear out of keeping with the characteristic use of stone and render in the surrounding area. Consequently, the proposal would appear as an incongruous feature, at odds with the appearance of surrounding properties. This would detract from the area's attractive uniform qualities identified above.
10. Taking all of the above into account, I find that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the area. This would be contrary to the Framework, to South Northamptonshire Local Plan (1997) saved policies G3, H17 and EV1, and to the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance for Residential Extensions, which together amongst other things, seek to protect local character.

Living conditions

11. The proposed development would be located adjacent to the rear garden fence of No 40 Glebe Rise. During my site visit, I observed this fence to be tall and noted that only the very top of the proposed garage would be visible above it. Furthermore, the proposal would be some distance away and off-set from the rear elevation of No 40.
12. Taking the above into account, I find that the proposal, whilst visible from the rear of No 40, would not result in significant harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of that property in respect of outlook and there is no substantive evidence before me to the contrary. However, the absence of harm in this respect is not something that outweighs the harm identified above.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, the appeal does not succeed.

N McGurk

INSPECTOR