



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 January 2022

by Elaine Benson BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 08 February 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/K3415/D/21/3280034

The Bungalow, Park Lane, Huddlesford, Lichfield WS13 8QD

- 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 Adam Cooper Homes Ltd against the decision of Lichfield District Council.
 - The application Ref 21/00622/FUL, dated 31 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 29 July 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as 'proposed garage'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. This is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the surrounding rural area.

Reasons

3. The proposed garage would be erected on a cleared site which formerly contained a bungalow. It is in a rural area predominantly surrounded by open fields. The appellant's wider site includes land on the directly opposite side of Park Lane on which a replacement dwelling has been constructed.
4. There are dwellings dotted sporadically along Park Lane, some of which have detached garages or outbuildings opposite the main dwelling. These include the nearby Bailey Cottage which straddles the road. However, these outbuildings are of a much smaller overall scale than that proposed in this appeal.
5. The scale and massing of the garage would result in a large and bulky form of development that would appear incongruous in its rural surroundings when taking into consideration the size of the appeal site, the bulk, scale and proximity of the replacement dwelling and its garage and the predominantly undeveloped character of the surrounding area. Whilst the garage would be on the site of a demolished building, the context of this site is now materially and significantly different following the erection of the replacement dwelling and garage opposite.
6. The appellant's justification for the proposed garage includes the need for further storage for a large family with a large garden to maintain, as there is limited space around the dwelling and if the double garage is used for its designated purpose, storage space would be limited. However, a requirement for additional storage, and potentially additional parking spaces, is insufficient

to justify the resulting harm to local character and it could in any event be provided in another form.

7. For the foregoing reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the surrounding rural area and would be contrary to Policies CP3 and BE1 of the Lichfield Local Plan Strategy which state that all new development should carefully respect the surrounding built vernacular with regard to architectural design and scale, and Policy D1 of the Whittington and Fisherwick Neighbourhood Plan which sets out similar design criteria for new development.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons set out above, the appeal is dismissed.

Elaine Benson

INSPECTOR