



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 October 2017

by Andrew Dawe BSc(Hons) MSc MPhil MRTPI

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

Decision date: 3rd November 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/B1605/W/17/3180223

Winsmore, North Road East, The Reddings, Cheltenham GL51 6RD

- 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 Jason Hock against the decision of Cheltenham Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 17/00564/FUL, dated 17 March 2017, was refused by notice dated 12 May 2017.
 - The development proposed is dwelling and detached garage and all associated works (re-submission of 16/02282/FUL).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. Planning permission has been previously granted for the proposed dwelling but without the detached garage. North Road East is characterised by dwellings and associated buildings that are generally set well back from the road, albeit to varying degrees, behind and softened by planted front gardens in many cases. This gives the streetscene a pleasant sense of openness and spaciousness. There are some instances of particularly high and dense front boundary screen hedges in the vicinity but these are not the norm and do not detract from that general open and spacious character.
4. Within that context, the proposed garage would introduce an uncharacteristic built form into the front part of the site, close to the roadside boundary. There would be some scope for it to be partially screened by front boundary hedgerow and the side boundary fence. However, it is likely that at least the upper part of the building would still be clearly visible over that boundary treatment. Furthermore, the ongoing longer term maintenance or health of the front hedgerow, whether supplemented by additional planting or not, could not be guaranteed in terms of maintaining the degree of screening shown on the submitted plans. That would relate both to its height and density and so could result in greater still exposure of the proposed garage. It is also likely that the garage would be clearly visible via the vehicular access to the site.

5. I saw that there are other garages in the street set forward of the respective dwellings, at properties known as Fosseway and Rye Lodge. These are next to each other further along the street to the north-west, and that of Fosseway in particular is clearly visible from the vicinity of the site. However, their circumstances are different to that proposed in that they are both set further back from the road. They do not therefore set a precedent for the proposed garage and are not representative of the prevailing nature of development in the streetscene.
6. For the above reasons, despite the intended complementary materials to the associated dwelling, the proposed garage would be seen as a jarring and obtrusive feature of the streetscene.
7. My attention has also been drawn by the appellant to other cases in different streets within the wider surrounding area where there are garages, and in one case an electricity sub-station, forward of the front elevations of dwellings. However, I saw that the circumstances relating to those cases were different to those of the appeal scheme in terms of the respective streetscenes. I have in any case determined the appeal proposal on its own merits.
8. The proposed garage, for the above reasons, would therefore cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area. As such, it would be contrary to policy CP7 of the Cheltenham Borough Local Plan Second Review which, amongst other things, requires development to complement and respect neighbouring development and the character of the locality.

Conclusion

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

Andrew Dawe

INSPECTOR