



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 July 2019

by S Shapland BSc (Hons) MSc MILT

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 August 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/D3315/D/19/3228324

5 Mountway Road, Bishops Hull, Taunton, Somerset TA1 5LR

- 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 Kieran Roe against the decision of Taunton Deane Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 38/19/0082, dated 14 March 2019, was refused by notice dated 03 May 2019.
 - The development proposed was originally described as "Triple Car-port/Garage".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The Council has altered the description of the development on the decision notice to read "Erection of a triple car port/garage to the front of 5 Mountway Road, Bishops Hull". The appeal form submitted by the appellant has also altered the description to read "Erection of triple garage". I have taken the description of the development from the Council's decision notice as this is a more precise description of the development, and I have considered the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the appeal site and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is a detached dwelling located in an established residential area. Properties on this side of Mountway Road are a mixture of semi and detached properties, which are all set back from the edge of the public highway. The set back distance for these properties is relatively uniform, which gives the appearance of a continuous unbroken building line along the road. There are a variety of boundary treatments for these properties, including bricked walls, fencing and hedgerows. However, with the set back distances of properties along the road the street scene feels spacious and open.
5. The appeal property currently has a large open gravelled parking area to the front of the dwelling. The appeal scheme proposes the construction of a large

- garage in this space in front of the property, which would be orientated away from the host property. As such the building would protrude a considerable distance from the established building line and introduces built form into a currently open space at the front of the property. This is out of keeping with the existing form and pattern of development and causes harm to the character and appearance of the area. Furthermore, introducing built form in this location would remove the spacious nature of the front of the property, to the detriment of the overall street scene.
6. The appeal property benefits from a high hedgerow along the front boundary which would go some way to screen the proposed garage. However, the proposal is higher than this hedgerow, and given the open nature of the front spaces along Mountway Road the proposal would still be visible from several points on the public highway.
 7. Accordingly, I find that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area. As such it conflicts with policy DM1 of the Adopted Taunton Deane Core Strategy 2011-2028. This policy seeks, amongst other things, to ensure that the character and appearance of the street scene is not harmed by development.
 8. I recognise that there have been no objections from neighbours in respect of the proposal. The appellant requires the proposed garage to provide cover for his vehicles to aid with security, as well as providing storage for additional garage items. There is no other space on the property to provide similar storage space. However, such personal needs and circumstances do not outweigh the harm I have identified from the proposals.
 9. I note that the appellant would be willing to consider a smaller garage and has requested clarification over the scale of development that would be acceptable. I can only consider the appeal on the basis of the plans before me, and it is not within the remit of this appeal to determine if a smaller scheme would be acceptable.
 10. The appellant has drawn my attention to No 1 Mountway Road, which has been extended from a 3 to 5-bedroom bungalow. I have not been provided with any substantive details of that proposal, however it was evident from my site visit that the street scene on that side of the road differs from that of the appeal site. I do not consider that a residential extension and a new garage are directly comparable, and I can therefore give little weight to this and do not consider this matter out-weighs the harm I have otherwise identified.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above the appeal is dismissed.

S Shapland

INSPECTOR