



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 July 2022

by Emma Worley BA (Hons) Dip EP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17th August 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/W2845/D/22/3298446

7 East End, Scaldwell, Northampton NN6 9LB

- 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 M Howard against the decision of West Northamptonshire Council.
 - The application Ref WND/2022/0033, dated 14 January 2022, was refused by notice dated 10 March 2022.
 - The development proposed is a detached garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a semi-detached 2 storey brick and tile dwelling in a row of similar properties on the edge of the village, with views of the open countryside beyond. The adjoining properties in the row are arranged in a linear configuration and are set back a similar distance from the road, which creates a strong and consistent front building line in this group of dwellings. Neither the entrance to the recreation ground to the rear of the dwellings nor the front extensions to properties disturb the arrangement. The siting and layout of the dwellings in the row contributes positively to the pleasant semi-rural open character of the street scape on this side of the road.
4. The proposal would be a detached pitched roof garage to the front of the dwelling, on lower ground between the dwelling and the highway. As a result of its scale and siting, the proposal would introduce a substantial structure into the otherwise open frontage of the site. As a consequence, it would be an unduly visually dominant and anomalous feature which would obscure views of the dwelling from the road and detract from the open character of this side of East End.
5. I note the Council's concerns about the proposed use of render to the side and rear elevations of the garage. In this regard, the render would differ in appearance to the facing bricks used in the host dwelling and the adjoining properties in the row. However, it would not be dissimilar to external materials evident in the wider street scene, including those on the opposite side of the road to the appeal site. As such the use of render in the construction of the

garage would not diminish local distinctiveness or detract from the coherence of the immediate street scene taking into account the presence of render in the area.

6. Therefore, I conclude that the proposed garage, by virtue of its scale and siting, would harm the character and appearance of the area. Even if I accepted the appellant's view that the Scaldwell Village Design Statement carries limited weight, the proposal would conflict with Policy ENV10 of the Settlements and Countryside Local Plan (Part 2) For Daventry District 2011-2029, Adopted February 2020, which, among other things, seeks high quality design in order to ensure that development blends well with its surroundings. It would also conflict with the design aims of the National Planning Policy Framework including maintaining a strong sense of place.

Other Matters

7. My attention has been drawn to a number of other detached garages in the village, which I saw during my site visit. I also note appeal decision APP/L2820/A/07/2048970. However, the specific contexts of the other sites differ, and they are not comparable to the appeal scheme. They do not, therefore, lead me away from my findings in relation to the proposed development. In any case, each proposal is to be considered on its own merits.
8. The proposed garage would provide secure storage at the site. The appellant has suggested that he could retain the existing storage container in the front garden, to meet this need if the appeal should fail. Even if this was a realistic and lawful fallback position, there would be no guarantee that the temporary storage container would be retained by the future occupiers. In any case, it would not be a permanent building that would cause the harm I have found. Therefore, it does not justify proposal.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given, the appeal scheme would conflict with the development plan and there are no material considerations worthy of sufficient weight that would indicate a decision other than in accordance therewith. The appeal should therefore be dismissed.

Emma Worley

INSPECTOR