The Planning Inspectorate

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 November 2020

**by Thomas Hatfield BA (Hons) MA MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 19th November 2020**

**Appeal Ref: APP/B3410/W/20/3257656**
**Ardsley House, Allens Lane, Marchington, ST14 8LA**

- 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 D Dolman against the decision of East Staffordshire Borough Council.
- The application Ref P/2020/00334, dated 24 March 2020, was refused by notice dated 1 June 2020.
- The development proposed is a detached garage.

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## Application for Costs

2. An application for costs was made by D Dolman against East Staffordshire Borough Council. This application is the subject of a separate decision.

## Main Issue

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

## Reasons

4. Ardsley House is a modern detached property on the edge of the village of Marchington. It is positioned on the eastern side of Allens Lane, which is a historic sunken lane with high banks on either side.

5. The development would introduce a large 2-storey double garage at the front of the property. This would be on elevated ground and it would be prominent in views along the street, particularly from the south west. From these positions it would appear as an unduly large, overbearing structure in advance of the building line. Its height and bulk would contrast sharply with its surroundings, and would result in a dominant feature that would draw the eye. Its elevated position would further exacerbate its discordant appearance. Moreover, the existing hedgerow along the site frontage would provide only limited screening to the proposal in views along the street.

6. My attention has been drawn to a recent approval (Ref P/2018/00460) for a new detached garage in front of High Meadow, which is next door to the appeal property. At the time of my site visit, this garage appeared to have been constructed. However, it is significantly smaller in size than the current

proposal and is screened in longer views along Allens Lane by mature planting. In this regard, it is only clearly visible from along a short section of the street in front of the host property. The garage is also constructed in timber which results in a more sympathetic, natural appearance. It is therefore dissimilar to the appeal proposal in a number of respects and does not lend support to it.

7. My attention has also been drawn to other garages and properties in the wider area. However, these are not within the immediate vicinity of the appeal site and have only a limited visual relationship with it. With regard to the garage in front of The Orchards, that was consented in 1989 (Ref HO/18377/003) under a different planning context. In any case, it is a significantly smaller structure than is proposed here. With regard to the garage block in front of Hall Croft House (and the proposed extension to it) this is partly obscured by a mature boundary hedge. Moreover, this development, and the dwellings at the corner of Allens Lane and Hall Lane, sit within a different context around the road junction. These examples are also some distance from the appeal site, and in my view, their presence does not lend support to it.

8. I note that the appeal site is outside of the Marchington Conservation Area, and that there is some variation in the design of properties along Allens Lane. However, those considerations do not alter my view that the development would be a discordant feature within the street.

9. For the above reasons, I conclude that the development would significantly harm the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore be contrary to Strategic Policy 1, Strategic Policy 24, Detailed Policy 1, and Detailed Policy 3 of the East Staffordshire Local Plan (2015), and Policies DP1 and H3 of the Marchington Neighbourhood Plan (2016). These policies seek to ensure, amongst other things, that new development is of high quality design, is of an appropriate scale, and respects local patterns of development.

**Conclusion**

10. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*Thomas Hatfield*

INSPECTOR