Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 February 2015

by SD Harley BSc(Hons) MPhil MRTPI ARICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 10 February 2015

Appeal Ref: APP/A2525/D/14/2229757
258 Bridge Road, Sutton Bridge, Spalding, Lincs PE12 9SH

- 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 Keith Wiles against the decision of South Holland District Council.
- The application Ref H18-0462-14, dated 28 May 2014, was refused by notice dated 9 October 2014.
- The development proposed is erection of garage (retrospective).

Preliminary matter

1. The description of the proposed works has not been stated on the planning application form. The Council has described the application as set out above and I have considered the appeal on this basis.

2. The garage has been constructed as the appellant initially considered it did not require express planning permission.

Decision

3. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the garage on the character and appearance of the area taking account of its size, design and position.

Reasons

5. Number 258 Bridge Road is a house on the corner of a main route on the outskirts of Sutton Bridge. It has a privet hedge on the side boundary and a low wall with fence behind on the front boundary. The character of the area is mainly residential with some commercial properties including the nearby garage and commercial vehicle recovery yard. The houses have developed over a long period of time and are very varied in appearance.

6. The garage is a large building some 10m long and between 3m and 5m wide. The plans indicate the height of the roof as between 2.8m and 3.1m; an accompanying letter says the actual finished external heights are 2.9m to 3.35m, partly due to joists and a metal roof which allowed for insulation and that the floor level is elevated to forestall flooding. The building projects significantly forward of the front wall of the house and is positioned very close to the hedge on the side boundary.

7. Policy SG14 of the South Holland Local Plan, 2006, (the LP) seeks to ensure developments make a positive contribution to the architectural and visual quality of the surroundings and respect the local area in terms of scale, height, materials and relationship with existing buildings. This policy although of some age broadly conforms to those principles of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) that seek to protect the character and appearance of areas.

8. Notwithstanding the privet hedge on the side boundary, which helps to soften its appearance to some extent, and other buildings/fences at the property, due to its size, height and position the garage is visually prominent. It does not respect the local area in scale, height, design or materials or sit comfortably in the context of existing buildings to the side or rear and is a discordant visual feature.

9. For the reasons set out above I conclude that the garage has a detrimental effect on the character and appearance of the area. Accordingly it does not conform with Policy SG14 of the LP or those principles of the Framework that seek to ensure good design that respects the character and appearance of the area.

Other matters

10. I have taken account of the appearance of commercial premises nearby, but nothing I have seen has convinced me that the appeal proposal is appropriate in a garden in this prominent corner location.

11. The appellant says that a somewhat smaller building could be erected without the need for planning permission. Be that as it may, in my view a smaller building would be less intrusive than the proposal now before me and accordingly that carries little weight in my conclusion.

12. I have taken account of the comments that have been made as a result of consultation on the planning application. There are many reasons why third parties may or may not comment on a planning application, and whilst I have taken the comments into account I have come to my own conclusion on the basis of the planning merits of the case.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons set out above, and taking into account all other relevant matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

SDHarley

INSPECTOR