



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 February 2022

by A Tucker BA (Hons) IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 01 March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/F0114/D/22/3290642

73 Uplands Road, Saltford, BS31 3HN

- 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 Smith against the decision of Bath and North East Somerset Council.
 - The application Ref 21/04078/FUL, dated 31 August 2021, was refused by notice dated 28 October 2021.
 - The development proposed is prefabricated garage erection to the north east corner of garden.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is located in a residential area. Dwellings in the area are consistent in terms of their overall siting, with most set back from the road and most front gardens only modestly enclosed. This gives the area a spacious character. Ancillary buildings such as garages are mainly set alongside dwellings. The appeal site is located at a point of transition, with single storey dwellings to one side and two storey semi detached dwellings to the other.
4. The appeal site is prominently located between two road junctions, and thus its front area is more conspicuous than most as it is visible from the ends of the adjoining roads as well as from the road that it fronts. An existing side extension steps forward beyond part of the existing dwelling's front elevation, however this largely aligns with the host dwelling and does not extend beyond the projection at its northwest end. The area of the proposal is already enclosed behind a tall fence which is unusual, as most front areas are more open, although the upper part of the fence is formed with a section of trellis.
5. The proposed garage would sit behind this fence and would be wholly to the front of the existing dwelling. It would occupy an irregular area, which would mean that its side elevation facing the road would be long. The existing fence would be retained, however the proposal's solid and bulky form would be seen over the height of the fence and through the upper trellis sections. The fence would provide no screening of the building when viewed from the north across the front of the plot or from the wide verge associated with the adjacent road junction. From these perspectives the garage would be prominent to view, and

would appear to be at odds with the position of other garages, which are set back beside dwellings. Its flat roof form would also be unlike other similar buildings, which have pitched roofs.

6. At my visit I could see that there were other pre-fabricated garage buildings nearby, however none were as prominently sited as the proposed garage would be and most were single garages with pitched roofs. I could see no large buildings positioned entirely to the front of dwellings nearby in a similarly prominent manner. Therefore, the proposal building would appear quite out of place.
7. I appreciate that the building would give a large secure storage area that would benefit the occupiers of the host dwelling, however this matter is not sufficient to outweigh the harm I have identified.
8. In summary, the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area. It would be contrary to Policy CP6 of the Bath and North East Somerset Core Strategy 2014 and Policies D1, D2, D3 and D5 of the Bath and North East Somerset Placemaking Plan 2017, which together seek to ensure that development proposals are designed to a high quality that contribute positively to local character and distinctiveness.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons above, the appeal should be dismissed.

A Tucker

INSPECTOR