



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 July 2023

by Ben Plenty BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 July 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/J3720/D/23/3319110

97 Banbury Road, Ettington, STRATFORD-UPON-AVON, Warwickshire CV37 7SR

- 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 Paul Coleman against the decision of Stratford-on-Avon District Council.
 - The application Ref 22/03615/FUL, dated 9 December 2022, was refused by notice dated 2 March 2023.
 - The development proposed is detached timber garage to front garden of detached bungalow.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed garage on the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. Banbury Road is the main road through the village. The area consists of dwellings of various types and scales with predominantly traditional rural styles. Housing, close to the site, is recessed some distance beyond landscaped gardens with frontages that are absent built form. The streetscene therefore consists of houses within a subdued and verdant setting. The site is recessed into its plot and enclosed by tall hedge planting. Consequently, due to its verdant and recessed nature, the appeal dwelling, makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the local area.
4. The proposed garage would have a flat roof resulting in a building with a low profile. It would be ahead of the established front building line of the host dwelling, and its neighbouring dwellings, in a prominent front position. It would be a short distance from the front boundary of the site, behind an existing hedge. It would therefore, present a partially hidden feature within the public realm despite its frontage position.
5. Nonetheless, the Council's Development Requirements SPD seeks that outbuildings should ideally be sited to the side or rear of a dwelling to reduce their prominence. Whilst not fully prohibitive of other locations, such an approach would ensure that the main dwelling remains the prominent built component on a site and that frontages remain free of development to the benefit of planting.

6. The retained hedging would limit views of the proposal, although its side would be partially visible through the site access having a harmful impact on the streetscene. Furthermore, if the hedging were reduced or removed the prominence of the proposed garage would be increased. As the existing hedging does not offer a permanent screen, its loss would expose the structure to the street to the detriment of the distinctive character of the village. In any event despite the noted screening, due to its prominent location, the proposal would be out of character with the existing pattern of development.
7. During my visit I noted that a garage had been erected in the frontage of 55 Banbury Road. However, this feature is only slightly ahead of the front elevation of its neighbouring property. This means that long views of the garage, when approaching the site along Banbury Road, are partially obscured by the adjacent building. Therefore, whilst this is relatively obtrusive, it has a reduced impact on the surrounding streetscene, due to the context of surrounding built form.
8. Furthermore, I have noted that the neighbouring detached dwelling has been extended to the front. Nonetheless, this is a discreet addition that maintains the overall undeveloped character of its frontage. I also noted the timber marquee to the rear of the Chequers public house. This is a subservient building in comparison to the main building, having a limited visual effect on the surrounding area. Consequently, these nearby developments do not set a clear precedent for the proposed garage. Also, conditions to secure a different cladding material for the garage, or for additional landscaping, would not mitigate the identified harm.
9. Accordingly, the proposed garage would harm the character and appearance of the site and the surrounding area. Consequently, the proposal would conflict with policies CS.9 and CS.12 of the Core Strategy [2016], policy BE1 of the Ettington and Fulready Neighbourhood Development Plan [2018] and part O of the Council's design guide [2019]. These policies seek development that, among other matters, does not damage features that positively contribute to the local context and would not harm the distinctive character of special landscape areas.
10. There are no material considerations that indicate the application should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. For the reasons given above, I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Ben Plenty

INSPECTOR