
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 January 2023

by David Troy BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 January 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/W3710/D/22/3308972

15 Grassington Drive, Nuneaton, Warwickshire CV11 6WE

- 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 Dale Higgott against the decision of Nuneaton & Bedworth Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 038952, dated 9 June 2022, was refused by notice dated 4 August 2022.
 - The development proposed is erection of single storey garage to front of house.
-

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 two storey detached dwelling with a single storey extension and attached garage to the front located in a mature well-established residential area. Grassington Drive is characterised by detached properties of varied styles and design set back from the road behind front gardens/driveways. Where garages and other extensions exist in front of the residential properties, these are low, clearly subsidiary, and have little impact upon the sense of space and openness in the area.
4. The appeal proposal would involve the construction of a garage that would project out by about 6.0m from the front of the property with a dual pitched tiled roof. The proposed garage would be set back from the public highway behind a boundary wall and gate running along the front of the site.
5. The appeal property is on a relatively spacious plot and as such the garage would not appear overlarge, relative to the overall plot size. The scale and form of the proposed garage built in the front of the main house would nevertheless still be a significant addition relative to the main property. As such, although set in from the front boundary of the site, the proposed garage would result in substantial bulk at the front of the main dwelling that would be out of character with the more modest form and appearance of the host building and would compromise the sense of space and openness in the area.

6. These shortcomings would be exacerbated by the proposal's prominent position, where the proposed garage would be visible from a number of public vantage points along Grassington Drive. The proposed garage, by virtue of its scale and siting, would fail to achieve an appropriate degree of subordination to the host property. As such, I consider that the proposed garage would result in an incongruous and out-of-keeping addition that would cause unacceptable harm to the character of the area.
7. I have considered the appellant's arguments that the design and layout of the garage have been carefully considered in order to take into account the character of the host property and to minimise any impacts on the area. However, whilst the use of matching materials and fenestrations would assist in integrating the proposal with the host property and the area, these aspects do not overcome the adverse effects outlined above.
8. Consequently, I conclude that the proposed garage would adversely harm the character and appearance of the area. It is contrary to the overall aims of Policy BE3 of the Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough Plan 2019 and the Council's Sustainable Design and Construction Supplementary Planning Document 2020. This policy and guidance, amongst other things, seek to ensure that development proposals and residential extensions are of a high quality design that respect and harmonise with the design, character and layout of the property and the pattern of development in the surrounding area and contribute to the local distinctiveness and the character of the area.

Other Matters

9. I have noted the other developments in the area drawn to my attention by the appellant. However, the garage to the front of No. 8 Grassington Drive is of a different scale and form to the appeal proposal. The various garages and extensions to the front of the properties within the surrounding area have different development and locational characteristics to the appeal scheme. In any event, each proposal falls to be assessed primarily on its own merits and I am unaware of the full circumstances associated with these other cases.
10. I have considered the various benefits put forward by the appellant that the proposal would bring, including the scheme's high quality design, providing additional improved security due to local crime and meeting the needs of the appellant's family. While I have given them some weight, these modest benefits would not be sufficient to outweigh the harm I have identified. For all these reasons, there are no other material considerations to outweigh the development plan conflicts identified.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

David Troy

INSPECTOR