



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 April 2022

by G Ellis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13TH May 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/Y3940/D/22/3292307

207 East Gomeldon Road, Gomeldon, Salisbury SP4 6NA

- 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 Mrs Gaynor O'Leary against the decision of Wiltshire Council.
 - The application Ref PL/2021/10611, dated 10 November 2021, was refused by notice dated 5 January 2022.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a traditional style 2 bay oak frame carport.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. No.207 is a detached two storey property with a garage to the side, located towards the far end of East Gomeldon Road. Along the road residential properties are predominantly restricted to the northern side and comprise a variety of styles and ages. To the other side are open fields which gives the area a semi-rural appearance. The properties are set back from the road, and whilst vegetation does form the front boundary to some properties, generally the large frontages are free from built form.
4. The proposal would introduce a detached building sited just behind the front boundary. The two-bay structure which comprises a garage and an open car port element would be constructed of timber. The Council accept that the general design is appropriate for the property and locality, and I have no reason to disagree. However, due to the proposed siting and its height the garage would be a notable feature in the street scene. I accept overtime the newly planted hedge would start to provide screening, reducing its dominance, nonetheless, it would still be visually prominent, and its siting would be out of keeping with the prevailing pattern of development.
5. The Council has suggested that there is an east/west split in terms of the character of the road, although it is not clear where this division is, and I tend to agree with the appellant that the whole road has a similar character. As highlighted by the appellant there is a small group of dwellings (Nos.173,175, 179 and 181) which do have garages to the front. However, these are linked to the property and/or set some distance back from the front boundary, and the

Council explain that they were part of the original design. This row of adjoining properties is also at a point where there are some buildings to the other side of the road. Similarly, there are a few garages/structures to the front of properties further along East Gomeldon Road where there is development opposite in Broadfield Road. As such, there is a slight change in the appearance at these points where the road is more enclosed. Moreover, the small number of existing garages identified along the long length of East Gomeldon Road are, in my view, more of an exception rather than a defining feature of the area and I cannot agree with the appellant that the proposal would be read in connection with numerous other garages.

6. The appellant has also indicated that views of the garage would be limited to glimpses by car users. However, to the north side of East Gomeldon Road is a footpath which extends along the majority of its length. Also, as a long cul de sac it is a relatively quiet road with limited traffic and leads to a play area at the end. Therefore, in my opinion, the proposal would be seen by a variety of road users. Additionally, the boundary hedge will take time to mature, and the roof would still be visible above, and any substantial hedge height would itself be at odds with the open character of the area. Consequently, I do not find that a landscaping condition requiring the retention of a hedge, as suggested by the appellant, would make the proposal acceptable.
7. Overall, I find that the siting of the garage would result in an incongruous feature to the street scene, harmful to the character and appearance of the area. Thus, the proposal would be contrary to Wiltshire Core Strategy policy 57, which amongst other things, requires development to enhance local distinctiveness and integrate into its setting and wider character of the area. It would also conflict with the general guidance within the National Planning Policy Framework and National Design Guidance which promotes well designed places and development that is sympathetic to local character.

Other Matters

8. The Council has also cited Idmiston Parish Neighbourhood Plan policy 16 in the reason for refusal. This policy relates to housing, specifically "New builds on Old Plots" and as such I agree with the appellant that it is not directly relevant to this householder proposal. Nonetheless, this matter does not alter my overall findings.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons set out I dismiss the appeal.

G Ellis

INSPECTOR