



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 February 2022

by Mark Caine BSc (Hons) MTPL MRTPI LSRA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9 February 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/M0655/D/21/3268267

14 Meteor Crescent, Poplars and Hulme, Warrington WA2 0DU

- 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 Lukasz Kurzyk against the decision of Warrington Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2020/37788, dated 20 September 2020, was refused by notice dated 25 November 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as 'Rebuild new garage'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. A revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published on 20 July 2021. I have considered its provisions in relation to the appeal scheme and note that there are no significant changes from the 2019 iteration which would affect the main issues of the case.
3. The development applied for has been carried out.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the development on the street scene.

Reasons

5. The appeal relates to the front garden area of 14 Meteor Crescent, which is a two storey semi-detached dwelling. The western side of Meteor Crescent comprises similar semi-detached dwellings that are laid out in a roughly linear pattern. Most of these dwellings have low level front boundary walls presenting open grassed frontages to the properties and a spacious and relatively green suburban feel to this part of the street.
6. The development is a prefabricated single storey detached garage. The appellant's reason for siting it in the front garden rather than in the back garden area, where there is a lack of vehicular access, is noted. Nonetheless, the size, scale and bulk of the development is an obvious and prominent feature that is forward of the principal elevation of the appeal dwelling and the adjacent neighbouring properties on the western side of the road. Its introduction onto this land thereby results in a dominant, jarring and conspicuous feature that is out of context with the prevailing pattern of development and spacious layout of the immediate surroundings.

7. The discordant effect of the development is plainly visible along Meteor Crescent and from a number of neighbouring dwellings. Painting it the same colour as the house would not provide sufficient mitigation to overcome this harm.
8. I therefore find that the development has a significantly harmful effect on the street scene. It thereby conflicts with Policy QE7 of the Warrington Borough Council Local Plan Core Strategy 2014 (Local Plan) which seeks, amongst other matters, to ensure a high-quality place through proposals that are designed to enhance the character, appearance and function of the street scene, local area and wider townscape.

Other Matters

9. It has been put to me that the appellant requires a safe space to continue his hobby of repairing broken bikes and quads, and that this helps his anxiety and depression. Whilst I have sympathy for the appellant in this regard, personal circumstances seldom outweigh more general planning considerations, particularly where development would be permanent.
10. I also note the appellant's household's experience in respect of burglaries and vandalism. However, it has not been substantiated that the proposal is the only practical means of ensuring the security of the site.
11. In reaching my findings I have also had regard to the letters of support that have been submitted from local residents. Nonetheless, this is not a determining factor in the consideration of an appeal. The question is whether there is unacceptable harm to the street scene, even if letters of objection or support have been lodged. All of these matters do therefore not overcome or outweigh the harm that I have identified above.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, having taken account of the development plan as a whole, along with all other relevant material considerations, the appeal should therefore be dismissed.

Mark Caine

INSPECTOR