
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 May 2020

by R Cooper BSc (Hons) MCD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 May 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Y3425/D/20/3246684

Victoria House, Bromstead Common Lane, Bromstead Heath, Newport TF10 9DG

- 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 Andrew Jenner against the decision of Stafford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 19/31191/HOU, dated 13 September 2019, was refused by notice dated 12 November 2019.
 - The development proposed is a detached garage/workshop with storage above.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a detached two storey dwelling and associated gardens, that are positioned on a corner of Bromstead Common Lane. The area is rural in character, and consists primarily of detached two storey houses, with large gardens set within the countryside. The host dwelling is a traditional brick built period house, partially rendered. It's design, scale and materials are in keeping with neighbouring dwellings.
4. The proposed building would be sited in the garden of the property, adjacent to the boundary hedge and existing access. The garage would be positioned so that its gable would be in close proximity to the Lane. The building would be two storeys in height, and its width and length would result in a building similar in scale to the host dwelling, and surrounding houses. As such, the building would not be subordinate and would appear dominant within the appeal site and the surrounding area.
5. The proposed garage would have a mansard style roof, its elevations would be constructed predominantly in cedar, with brickwork to the lower level. The design would contrast significantly to the appearance of the host dwelling and would be out of kilter with the prevailing character and appearance of the area.
6. Whilst the appellant considers the windows are not overly domestic in appearance, this does not alter my opinion that the overall form of the building

is not in keeping or subordinate to the host dwelling, and it would not respect the context of the site in that regard.

7. There are existing hedges and trees around the boundary of the site. However, given the proposed height of the building and the open views into the site from the access, they would not sufficiently screen the building to overcome the harm I have identified above. Whilst the appellant has referred to the provision of a new wall to partially screen the building, this does not form part of the proposed development, and no details of such a proposal have been provided in the evidence before me.
8. The appeal property is located at the end of the Lane, which has no through route for traffic. However, it would be visible to neighbouring occupiers and visitors utilising the road, and its proposed scale and appearance would draw the eye, and it would be an incongruous feature within the Lane.
9. From the evidence provided I understand that planning permission has previously been granted for a 3 car garage and two-storey workshop (Ref 10/13189/FUL). However, I have not been provided the full details of this. In any event I am required to determine the application on its own merits based on the evidence before me.
10. Consequently, the proposed garage/workshop would harm the character and appearance of the area. It does not accord with Policies N1 and N8 of The Plan for Stafford Borough 2011-2031 (2014). It would also be inconsistent with the Stratford Borough Council Design Supplementary Planning Document (2018) and the National Design Guide (2019) which amongst other things, collectively seek to ensure that new development respects the local context of the site and preserve and enhance the character of the area.

Other Matters

11. I have considered that the windows would afford greater practicality for use of the first floor storage area, and that a home offices and workspaces should be functional and comfortable. However, this does not outweigh the harm to the character and appearance I have identified above.
12. Whilst the proposal would not result in loss of privacy and overlooking, this does not alter my findings in respect of the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, the appeal is dismissed.

R Cooper

INSPECTOR