The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 September 2020

by Jonathan Manning BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

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

Decision date: 5th October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Y3940/D/20/3254742
Burbank, Rectory Road, Alderbury, Salisbury, SP5 3AD

- 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 Dean O'Brien against the decision of Wiltshire Council.
- The application Ref 20/00954/FUL, dated 30 January 2020, was refused by notice dated 1 April 2020.
- The development proposed is to build a 2 bay oak garage with douglas fir featheredge cladding to match with the house.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue of the appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is located on Rectory Road and accommodates a detached dwelling. The surrounding area is mainly residential with a mix of dwelling types and architectural styles. The proposal would result in the construction of a 2 bay garage within the front garden of the appeal property. The proposed garage would be a significant structure that would be sited directly in front of the host dwelling and would extend close to the boundary of the appeal site with Rectory Road.

4. Despite the small setback in the footprint of the proposed garage, the scheme by virtue of its scale, bulk and siting would result in an overly dominant form of development that would detract from the character and appearance of the host dwelling. Whilst there is a wide range of dwelling styles and sizes within Rectory Road, along with a bowls club and village hall opposite the appeal site, I observed garages along this part of Rectory Road are generally either integrated or located to the side of the host dwelling. Consequently, the proposed garage would appear as an incongruous feature in the street scene, causing demonstrable harm to the character and appearance of the area.

5. I acknowledge the appellant's view that additional planting could be used to soften the impact of the scheme and this could be secured through a planning condition. However, given the height of the proposed garage, the roof would still likely be evident over any boundary hedge, as can be seen from the drawings provided in the appellant's appeal statement. Further, I observed

that the appeal property has a wide driveway and the proposed garage would still be very visible through the driveway when in the vicinity of the appeal site.

6. The appellant has provided many examples of other garages and car ports in the surrounding area. Whilst these are noted, many of these are located in surrounding roads that I observed on my site visit, have differing characteristics to Rectory Road. Further, I observed that the examples provided within Rectory Road were either not directly in front of the host dwelling or were set further back from the road, such as the garage at 'Little Acre'. Consequently, I am not of the view that the other examples provide any significant basis to justify this scheme or set a precedent.

7. I accept that the proposed materials would be appropriate and reflect those of the host dwelling and those in the immediate area. However, this does not overcome my concerns with regard to the scale, bulk and siting of the scheme.

8. Given all of the above, I conclude that the scheme would cause demonstrable harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy CP57 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy (2015) and Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Other matters

9. I accept that any additional boundary planting to screen the proposed garage would have some biodiversity enhancements. However, in my view, these are likely to be limited. I also acknowledge that the scheme proposes roof windows to allow maximum benefit from sunlight and passive solar energy to reduce energy demand. I do not consider that these matters are sufficient to individually or in combination outweigh the identified harm.

10. Several other concerns have been raised with regard to the proposed scheme. As I am dismissing the appeal on other grounds, such matters do not alter my overall conclusion and have therefore not had a significant bearing on my decision.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons set out above and having regard to all other matters raised, the proposal conflicts with the development plan when considered as a whole. There are no material considerations that individually or in combination outweigh the identified harm and associated development plan conflict, the appeal is therefore dismissed.

Jonathan Manning

INSPECTOR