
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 October 2017

by V Lucas LLB MCD MRTPI

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

Decision date: 17th November 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Y3425/D/17/3181105

Springfield House, Loynton, Woodseaves, Stafford, ST20 0QA

- 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 K Tatton against the decision of Stafford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 17/25972/HOU, dated 6 March 2017, was refused by notice dated 10 May 2017.
 - The development proposed is a detached garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a detached garage at Springfield House, Loynton, Woodseaves, Stafford, ST20 0QA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 17/25972/HOU, dated 6 March 2017, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plan: 1890/1
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development proposed on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. Springfield House is a brick built, detached dwelling with dormer windows in the front facing roof slope. The appeal property is of relatively modern construction and has a typical appearance of a domestic dwelling. It is visible from the lane which runs along the front boundary of the site. The dwelling is situated on a large plot within Loynton where there are only a small number of dwellings and a few farms. The lane that runs through the village is narrow and bordered by open countryside which is visible from the highway. The character of the area is therefore defined by a small number

of buildings with a spacious pattern of development surrounded by views of the rural landscape.

4. The development proposed would see the construction of a detached garage. It would be approximately 10m wide, 6.5m deep and 6.7m high. Three dormer windows would be inserted in the front facing roof slope. There is an extant permission for a detached garage at the appeal site. Work has commenced on implementing this scheme with concrete slab foundations having been laid. The appeal proposal before would be constructed on the same footprint as the extant scheme and would have the same width and depth. The difference between the two schemes is that it is now proposed to increase the height of the garage from 5m to 6.7m and to insert the dormer windows as shown on the submitted plans.
5. The extant scheme does represent a realistic fall-back position as building work has already commenced on it. Essentially, this appeal therefore turns on the effect of proposing to increase the height of the garage by approximately 1.7m and inserting three dormer windows in the front roof slope on the character and appearance of the area.
6. The proposed garage would be visible from the lane. It would be positioned in front of the appeal property but set to the left of it so that the main dwelling remains visible and separate. The garage would be orientated to face towards the dwelling so that its side elevation would face directly towards the highway. The proposed increase in height would increase the visibility of the garage from public viewpoints along the lane and the proposed dormers would also be visible.
7. However, the design of the garage would reflect that of main dwelling. Specifically, the proposed dormers would reflect those used in the front roof slope of the dwelling. The garage would therefore appear as a sympathetic addition to Springfield House and whilst it would have a domestic appearance due to the dormer windows, it would be seen in the context of the existing domestic appearance of the dwelling. Therefore no harm to the rural character of the area would occur. Whilst the proposal would result in an increase in height of the garage, it would not be as high as the dwelling itself and as a consequence the proposed garage would remain visually subordinate to the original property.
8. Accordingly, I conclude that the proposal would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. The proposal would therefore not conflict with policy N1 (g) of The Plan for Stafford (Adopted June 2014) which seeks to ensure that development secures enhancements in design quality by including high design standards and takes into account the local character.

Other Matters

9. I note that the Council officer's report states that land included within the red line of the application is not considered to form part of the domestic curtilage attached to the appeal dwelling. However, this appeal proposal does not seek a change in use of the land in that regard and so this consideration has not been relevant to my determination of the appeal.

Conclusion and Conditions

10. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.
11. I have considered the Council's suggested conditions in line with the advice in the Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG). I have attached a commencement condition and a condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the submitted plans in the interests of certainty. I have also attached a condition relating to matching materials for extensions. This will ensure that the proposal would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the area.

V Lucas

Inspector