



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 September 2020 by G Sibley MPLAN MRTPI

Decision by Chris Preston BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 September 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/J3720/D/20/3253607

7 Dugdale Avenue, Bidford-on-Avon, B50 4QE

- 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 S Bexfield against the decision of Stratford-on-Avon District Council.
 - The application Ref: 20/00092/FUL, dated 8 January 2020, was refused by notice dated 12 March 2020.
 - The development proposed single storey attached garage to side.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

- The effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the street scene.

Reasons for the Recommendation

3. No.7 is a detached dwelling that is located on the junction between Dugdale Avenue and Elliot Close. To the side of the dwelling facing towards Elliot Close is an area of landscaped land and there is a similar area of landscaped land on the opposite side of the junction.
4. The Development Requirements Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) (published 2019) notes that corners are a key element in place making in that they play a pivotal role in moving from one space to another and that a well designed corner will make an important contribution to the character and attractiveness of a space.
5. The development around Dugdale Avenue is relatively modern and appears to have been constructed as part of a larger estate. Further up the road is Drayton Close and the two dwellings either side of this junction have similar areas of landscaped land. The dwellings within the street scene are typically detached dwellings with in-built garages set within wide plots with undeveloped gaps either side of the dwellings. The areas of landscaped land as well as the

undeveloped gaps either side of the dwellings contributes to the attractive suburban appearance of the street scene.

6. No.7 is angled to face towards Dugdale Avenue and when approaching from the east towards Victoria Road the landscaped area of land is set forward of the dwelling. Because the garage would be built in that location, the front elevation would be extremely prominent on the corner of the junction and would block views into Elliot Close. The garage would introduce 'hard' built form into an area of 'soft' landscaping and this would detract from the suburban appearance of the street scene. Whilst a small strip of land would be left undeveloped, the construction of the garage would result in the dwelling extending across almost the full width of the plot which would be unusual within the street scene. The landscaped area is bound by relatively tall hedges and other vegetation and whilst the garage would be around the same height as some of these hedges, these hedges are an attractive form of boundary treatment on the corner of a junction. The structure would urbanise this corner plot and the retention of the hedges around the garage would not be able to adequately screen the proposal which would detract from the appearance of the street scene.
7. I note reference to other garages on corner plots elsewhere within the estate. Whilst there are some examples, they would appear to be part of the originally planned layout and their presence does not dilute from the attractive effect of the numerous landscaped corner plots which are an attractive part of the character of the area. For the reasons given, the proposal would erode that attractive feature at the appeal site and the presence of other garages does not provide a reason to cause harm to the character of the area.
8. In summary, the proposed garage would result in the loss of an area of landscaped land that positively contributes to the suburban appearance of the street scene and this would be contrary to the guidance set out in the SPD. Furthermore, the proposed garage would be contrary to policy CS.5 of the Stratford-on-Avon District Core Strategy 2011-2031 (CS) (adopted 2016) which states that proposals should protect landscape character and avoid detrimental effects on features which make a significant contribution to the character, history and setting of a settlement or area. The proposal would also be contrary to policy CS.9 of the CS which looks to ensure development proposals will reflect the context of the locality, ensuring a continuity of key design features that establishes the identity of the place, making best use of on-site assets including landscaping features as well as public views and vistas and not harming existing ones. The proposal would also be contrary to policy H5 of the Bidford-on-Avon Parish Neighbourhood Plan 2011-2031 (made 2017) which states that development on garden land should preserve or enhance that character of the area.

Other matters

9. It is noted that the proposal would create additional space to allow the appellant to work from home. Whilst the current situation has resulted in an increased need for individuals to work from home, these would be the personal circumstances of the appellant and the building would remain long after the personal circumstances which, though important, would be subject to change. Personal circumstances would scarcely ever justify a permanent building. Consequently, limited weight is given to the personal circumstances of the appellant.

Conclusion and Recommendation

10. The proposed garage would cause harm to the character and appearance of the street scene. Therefore, for the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

G Sibley

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

11. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report, and, on that basis, I too agree that the appeal should be dismissed.

Chris Preston

INSPECTOR