



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 November 2021 by Darren Ellis MPlan

Decision by R C Kirby BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 January 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/W2845/D/21/3279902

Dundry, 140 Sywell Road, Overstone NN6 0AG

- 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 & Mrs Barden against the decision of West Northamptonshire Council.
 - The application Ref WND/2021/0014, dated 30 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 27 May 2021.
 - The development proposed is a detached garage.
-

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

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

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal property is a two-storey detached dwelling on the northern side of Sywell Road. With a couple of exceptions on the opposite side of the road, the properties in this part of Sywell Road are set back from the road with generous front gardens and driveways, and the buildings follow a strongly defined building line. Most of the front boundaries have hedges of various heights and, overall, this part of Sywell Road has a distinctive and spacious character.
 5. The driveway area of the appeal property contributes positively to the spacious character of the area. The proposed garage would be positioned adjacent to the front boundary and therefore would be forwards of the predominant building line of the road and would have a minimal set back from the road. The garage would add clutter to the street scene and would therefore be an unsympathetic addition to the street scene. Furthermore, it would be at odds with the prevailing character due to its scale and position forward of the established building line. Consequently, the structure would detract from the distinctive and spacious character of the street.
-

6. Whilst the materials and design seek to reflect the character of surrounding houses, those matters do not mitigate for the impact on the open character of the street frontage arising from the unsympathetic location of the structure, as described above.
7. The property at No 148a has a garage to the front of the dwelling, however it is unclear when this garage was built and no details of any planning permission for the garage have been provided. This garage is an anomaly in this part of Sywell Road, however the effect of the garage on the street scene is partly mitigated by the position of No 148a at the end of the line of dwellings and adjacent to a school which has buildings and structures closer to the street than the dwellings are.
8. During my site visit I noticed that a dwelling further up Sywell Road, No 29, also has a garage adjacent to the street, however at this point the character of the street changes as some of the dwellings have little or no set back from the road. The garage at No 29 is therefore in keeping with the character of the street at that location. The appellant has also referred me to a garage at No 58, however this property is a considerable distance from and is not directly visible from the appeal site, and as such it has no bearing on the street scene at the appeal site.
9. For the reasons given, the proposed garage would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. The proposal would therefore be contrary to policies RA3 and ENV10 of the Settlements and Countryside Local Plan (Part 2) for Daventry District (February 2020) (LP), which require new development to protect the form and character of villages, to reinforce local distinctiveness and to blend in with the site and its surroundings. The proposal would also fail to comply with paragraph 130 (a) and (c) of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), which requires development to add to the overall quality of the area and to be sympathetic to local character. I further note that paragraph 134 of the Framework states that development that is not well designed should be refused.

Other matters

10. Overstone Gate opposite the appeal site is a Grade II listed building. Section 66 (1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires that special regard shall be had to the desirability of preserving a listed building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest that it possesses. However, given the nature and the limited scale of the proposed garage, the proposal would not have a significant impact on the setting of the listed building.
11. The Council's delegated report states that the proposed garage would cause an overbearing impact to the neighbouring property at No 142 and as such would conflict with policies RA3 and ENV10 of the LP in this regard, although this matter has not been included on the decision notice as a reason for refusal. However, as I am dismissing the appeal for other reasons this matter is not determinative.
12. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed because of the conflict with the development plan and there being no material considerations which

indicate that a decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan.

Darren Ellis

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

13. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and, on that basis, I agree with the recommendation and shall dismiss the appeal.

RC Kirby

INSPECTOR