



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 September 2023

by Ian McHugh DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 02 October 2023.

Appeal Ref: APP/X3025/W/23/3321282

3 Winchester Close, Mansfield, NG18 4HL

- 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 Steven Reid against the decision of Mansfield District Council.
 - The application Ref 2023/0094/HHA, dated 15 February 2023, was refused by notice dated 26 April 2023.
 - The development proposed is a single-storey double garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the appearance of the streetscene.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a part brick, part rendered detached bungalow, which is situated in a residential area of the town. Properties in the vicinity of the appeal site vary in terms of their appearance and scale. However, a common characteristic of Winchester Close is that the front gardens are devoid of any buildings. This gives the streetscene a relatively spacious and verdant appearance.
4. The proposal is to erect a double garage in the front garden area. It would be built relatively close to the road frontage. The external walls would be rendered and it would have a pantiled roof. The garage would sit at a lower level than the existing dwelling because the site slopes down towards the road. However, no sections or site levels have been submitted.
5. The Council considers that the proposal would be incongruous in the streetscene and the use of render would not be compatible with character of Winchester Close. It states that the development would conflict with Policies P2 and P6 of the Mansfield District Local Plan (LP). These policies seek to ensure (amongst other things) that development reflects the character of the area and that it would not have an adverse effect on the streetscene. I consider these accord with paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2023, which contains similar provisions.
6. The appellant points to there being no objections from neighbours and that the garage could be screened by a wall and planting and the external walls of the

garage could be brick rather than render. My attention has also been drawn to other garages in front gardens on Lindhurst Road and Clipstone Road West.

7. I accept that there are examples of garages in front gardens in the local area. However, my decision is based solely on the impact of the proposed garage on the Winchester Close streetscene. Regarding the use of render, I am not persuaded that it would be unduly harmful, given the use of render on the existing dwelling.
8. Nevertheless, the proposed garage would be a relatively large structure that would be unduly prominent and at odds with the prevailing open character and appearance of the streetscene. Although, the erection of a wall and planting may help to partly screen the garage, a wall of any substance could also be out of character with the other frontages along Winchester Close, which are enclosed by low brick or stone walls. Therefore, I consider that the proposal would have an unacceptably harmful effect on the appearance of the streetscene. Consequently, it would conflict with Policies P2 and P6 of the LP, as referred to in paragraph 5 above.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above, it is concluded that the appeal be dismissed.

Ian McHugh

INSPECTOR