



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 June 2019

by Christopher Miell MPlan MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 July 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/Y3940/W/19/3225550

Plot 2, 12, Former 12 Tidworth Road, Porton SP4 0NG

- 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 B Johnston (JJ Acquisitions) against the decision of Wiltshire Council.
 - The application Ref 18/12012/FUL, dated 20 December 2018, was refused by notice dated 18 February 2019.
 - The development is described as Proposed Car Barn – Plot 2.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The appellant's name has been taken from the appeal form. The appeal was submitted by Mr B Johnston. However, the original application form states Mr B Johnson. The appellant's agent has confirmed that the above parties are the same person and the surname was spelt incorrectly on the original application form. I have dealt with the appeal on that basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a recently constructed two-storey detached dwelling on the northern side of Tidworth Road. To the side of the property there is an integral garage. The property is set back from the highway and the front garden provides off-street parking for approximately three vehicles. The frontage to Tidworth Road is well landscaped and defined by coniferous planting, which reduces views of the parking area from the street.
5. The surrounding area has a suburban residential character and there are a variety of property types along Tidworth Road. On the northern side of the road, the properties are predominately detached and set back from the highway behind large front gardens. The gardens are typically well landscaped and provide off-street vehicle parking. Where ancillary outbuildings, such as garages, have been erected they are located to the side or rear of the host building behind the building line. The openness of the front gardens contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area.

6. It is proposed to erect a detached car barn to the front of the dwelling on an area of existing hardstanding. The car barn would be enclosed on three sides and provide off-street parking for two vehicles. The building would have a timber clad exterior with a half-hipped slate tile roof.
7. Despite what could be seen as an attractive design, the outbuilding's location within the dwelling's front curtilage would not be reflective of the pattern of development within the local area, whereby other ancillary outbuildings are predominately sited to the side or rear of the host building and front garden areas are open and undeveloped. As such, the proposal would be an incongruous and unduly prominent form of development when viewed from the street, which would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the area.
8. The appellant states that the proposed building would partially screen views of the existing parking area from Tidworth Road, which would be an improvement upon the existing arrangement, whereby parked cars are partially visible from the street. Even if I were to accept this view, the benefit of screening the parking area from the street would not outweigh the significant harm to the character and appearance of the area, which I have identified above.
9. For the collective reasons outlined above, I conclude that the proposal would significantly harm the character and appearance of the area. As such, the proposal does not accord with Policy CP57 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy (Adopted January 2015) and the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance: Creating Places – A guide to achieving high quality design in new development (Adopted April 2006), which amongst other things requires high quality design that relates positively to the existing pattern of development, local characteristics and the wider character of the area.
10. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Christopher Miell

Inspector