

31 July 2024

**For the Urgent attention of Daniel Arden**

Solihull MBC  
Planning Department

***Sent by Email only:***

Dear Daniel

**PL/2023/02415/MINFOT**

**REPLACE SINGLE GARAGE WITH NEW GARAGE (FOLLOWING PLANNING APPLICATION PL/2023/01333/MINFOT).**

**LAND ADJOINING 8 BELLE VUE TERRACE HAMPTON IN ARDEN SOLIHULL**

We wish to record our strong concerns about the above application. This application for a Single Garage was received last November, but it was a fallback application because the proposal of a Double Garage on the same site was refused by SMBC and was going through an Appeal. On appeal the Inspector also turned down the Double Garage proposal, so we presume the Single Garage proposal is once more live.

On the face of it, a proposal to replace an existing, near derelict, Single Garage with a bigger and better Single Garage might seem innocuous. However, it is clear from the application that this is simply a scaled down version on the Double Garage proposal, and although the visual impact of the building proposal is reduced, the proposed use and impact on the character and amenity of a road in the Conservation Area remains unchanged.

The Applicant has stated in his Heritage Statement that he runs a business, Hampton Landscaping, from his home, 9, Nesfield Grove, Hampton-in-Arden which involves the use of two trucks. At present, **over-night and week- end parking is provided for their trucks on the front drive of his home which, together with the three private cars he also owns proves to be a challenge.**

His Statement goes on to say '*Disturbance to the neighbours arises from the necessity of at least one of the five vehicles owned by the Applicant which, at times, must be parked on the (narrow) adopted highway, off Nesfield Grove. Consequently, access to the Applicant's home and those of the neighbours is, from time to time, partially obstructed.*

*Furthermore, when all five of the vehicles are parked to the front and along the side of the Applicant's home, the outlook proffered to the neighbours is unsightly. The locality is of a 'compact' neighbourhood with ten houses fronting Nesfield Grove. This scenario is mirrored by other, similar, cul-de-sacs in the immediate vicinity. The Applicant has deep concerns of the adverse impact this creates on the neighbours.'*

*Hampton-in-Arden Parish Council*

The Applicant says he wishes **to create a secure location for overnight and, if necessary due to daily workload, short-stay off-site parking of just one of the two trucks used for business purposes** to minimise the current adverse impact and disruption to the Applicant's neighbours.

This Proposal seeks permission for the replacement of the existing derelict (and unsightly) single garage, with that of a larger, single garage suitable for **one of the two open-backed trucks** owned by and used in the normal course of **the Applicant's locally based business**. The proposal states that when the truck leaves its garage for its intended use, it will be replaced by the applicant, or employee, leaving their own vehicle(s) to be parked on the property and vice versa on their return.

So effectively this application seeks to use the site as a storage depot for commercial trucks with daily swapping of the trucks for private vehicles. The bottom line is that the applicant appears to us to be seeking to run a commercial depot out of an entirely unsuitable residential property. This is unacceptable to the residents of Nesfield Grove, but it is not an answer to spread the problem across two unsuitable residential cul-de-sacs, one of which is in a Conservation Area, and next to a Heritage property, and has limited space for large vehicle manoeuvring.

When SMBC refused the application for the double garage they said:

*The proposed garage would disrupt the contribution of the open plots to the character and appearance of this part of the conservation area and ...would constitute a precedent for the development of further amenity plots in this row with an increasing adverse impact upon the character and appearance of this part of the conservation area....The proposed development would harm the significance of the undesignated heritage asset and it would not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Hampton in Arden Conservation Area. The proposal would conflict with Policy P16 of the Solihull Local Plan 2103, and as required by the NPPF the scheme presents no public benefits that would outweigh the harm to the heritage assets identified.*

When the application went to appeal the Planning Inspector rejected it saying:

*'The cumulative stated benefits would be modest and would not be sufficient to outweigh the less than substantial harm the appeal scheme would cause to the significance of the CA as a designated heritage asset. The Framework requires great weight be given to the asset's conservation, irrespective of the level of potential harm. Appeal Decision APP/Q4625/W/24/3336288.'*

He concluded that:

*'the proposal would adversely affect the setting of the NDHA, would fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the CA and thus would fail to satisfy the requirements of the PLBCAA. Accordingly, the proposal would also conflict with Policy P16 of the Solihull Local Plan (2013). This requires new development, amongst other matters, to preserve or enhance heritage assets.'*

Making the proposed building smaller does not detract from the entirely unsuitable activities and vehicle movements that will be inflicted upon the Conservation Area. Sharing the problem between one residential area and a Heritage area is not an acceptable solution. The applicant needs to run his business out of proper commercial premises.

We strongly recommend you reject this application.

Yours sincerely



**JULIE BARNES**  
**Clerk and Financial Officer**  
**Hampton in Arden Parish Council**