



## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 May 2022

**by A Caines BSc(Hons) MScTP MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 18 May 2022**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/V0728/D/22/3295886**

**79 Winchester Road, Redcar TS10 3QW**

- 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 Nathan Zagrovic against the decision of Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council.
  - The application Ref R/2021/0671/RT, dated 19 July 2021, was refused by notice dated 7 January 2022.
  - The development proposed is described as "a wooden car port frame (4 legs & roof and a clear roof) over my driveway situated at the front of my property (H 7.5ft W 10ft L 13.75ft). The main purpose of the structure is to keep guano from damaging cars parked on driveway - previous vehicles have been damaged causing extensive repair costs."
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Main Issue

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

### Reasons

3. The car port is already in situ and projects well in front of the strong linear building line formed by the front elevations of the host garage and neighbouring houses, stopping just short of the pavement edge. It is highly visible along the street, and from the public footpath that runs through the open space immediately opposite. There are no similar car ports, or other projecting structures of this extent at the front of the properties within the street. Thus, notwithstanding its open timber post construction, the car port has a pronounced and entirely unsatisfactory effect upon the Winchester Road street scene, to the detriment of the character and appearance of the area.
4. The proposal therefore conflicts with Policy SD4 of the Redcar and Cleveland Local Plan (2018), which among other things, requires development proposals to respect or enhance the character of the site and its surroundings.
5. I have taken into account that the car port offers protection from the effects of tree sap and bird droppings on the appellant's car. I also note that the site is not within a conservation area; has not resulted in the loss of garden and parking space at the property; and has not caused harm to the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers.

6. However, I have reached the conclusion that none of these are sufficient to outweigh the harm I have described and the resultant conflict with the development plan as a whole. Accordingly, I dismiss the appeal.

*A Caines*

INSPECTOR