



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 December 2024

by J D Westbrook BSc(Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7 April 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/C3430/D/24/3351377

10 The Pavement, Brewood, Staffordshire, ST19 9BZ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mrs Jo Stoneley against the decision of South Staffordshire Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/00452/FULHH.
 - The development proposed is the construction of a single-storey garage to the front of the property and a single-storey outbuilding to the rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The Council has indicated that it has no conservation objections to the outbuilding in the rear garden, and that it would not impact upon the character and appearance of the Brewood Conservation Area (CA). On this matter, I concur with the views of the Council. The main issue in this case, therefore, is the effect of the proposed garage on the character and appearance of the CA.

Reasons

3. No 10 is a detached house situated on a corner plot at the junction of The Pavement with St Chads Close. It is located on the southern edge of the village of Brewood, and near the southern boundary of the CA. The appeal site, along with other properties along The Pavement, slopes up from the road. The dwelling is sited well back from the road at the higher end of the plot. The lower end of the plot, between the dwelling and the front boundary, contains a large number of mature trees and shrubs, many of which will be removed, reduced or trimmed following a recent planning approval (ref: 23/00876/TREE).
4. The proposed development would involve the construction of a single-storey, detached double garage with a pitched roof to the front of the property. It would have a footprint of 6.7 metres by 6.5 metres, would be 4.3 metres high to the ridge, and would be sited in close proximity to the front boundary.
5. The appeal site occupies a prominent position on its corner plot along The Pavement. At the time of my site visit, the front garden of the property was still characterised by mature tree and shrub planting, chiefly to the east and front boundaries of the property. The proposed garage would be sited within 2 metres of the front boundary, in close proximity to where there is currently strong boundary

planting. If the planting were to be removed or trimmed in accordance with the earlier approval, the garage would become a very prominent and uncharacteristic feature in the street scene. The appellant has indicated that she intends to replant a more manageable hedgerow around the boundary, but I have no details of this and it does not form part of the application. A future planting scheme could potentially be conditioned, but given the position and height of the proposed garage, I am not convinced that a satisfactory condition could be imposed that would result in effective screening of the garage.

6. Policy EQ3 of the South Staffordshire Local Plan (LP) states that the Council will ensure that development which affects a heritage asset or its setting will be informed by a proportionate assessment of the significance of the asset, including its setting. Policy EQ11 of the LP indicates that proposals should respect local character and distinctiveness including that of the surrounding development, and that development should contribute positively to the streetscene and surrounding buildings. The South Staffordshire Design Guide (DG) states that garages should be positioned and designed so that they do not stand out abruptly from their surroundings. The Village Summary No 7 in the DG, which relates to Brewood, states that development on the edge of the village should enhance the strong hedgerow patterns and pastoral setting, and should also enhance the green edge.
7. In this case, the garage would be in a prominent position and would be readily visible in the streetscene, especially after removal or reduction of the boundary planting along the front of the property. As with the property on the opposite corner plot, the dwelling at No 10 is set well back from the front boundary and the character and appearance of the immediate area is established by spaciousness of the front gardens around the junction with boundary hedges and mature planting. The proposed garage would be positioned very close to the front boundary with a significant degree of separation from the main house. It would appear as an isolated structure, out of character with its immediate surroundings and harmful to the appearance of the area along the southern edge of the Village and this part of the CA. Whilst the harm to the CA would be less than substantial, there are no public benefits sufficient to outweigh that harm.
8. The appellant has made reference to certain garages that are found to the front of dwellings within the village. The nearest example is at No 20 The Pavement, but in this case the garage is set well back from the road and is a low, flat-roofed structure that appears as integrated with the main dwelling. Other examples referred to in relatively close proximity, along Sandy Lane, appear to relate to properties where the dwellings are sited closer to the road and where the garages relate closely, visually and functionally, to the main building. More distant examples within the CA are not in such prominent positions and/or stand out less in visual terms from the host dwelling. In any case, I have dealt with this current proposal on its own merits.
9. In conclusion, I find that the proposed garage would be harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area, and therefore to the wider CA. It would conflict with Policies EQ3 and EQ11 of the LP. Accordingly, I dismiss the appeal.

J D Westbrook

INSPECTOR