



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 June 2020 by S Watson BA(Hons) MSc

Decision by Mike Worden BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

An Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 June 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/B3410/D/20/3248325

Park View Farm, New Road, Uttoxeter ST14 5DT

- 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 D Jackson against the decision of East Staffordshire Borough Council.
 - The application Ref P/2019/01032, dated 14 August 2019, was refused by notice dated 7 February 2020.
 - The development proposed is two storey side extension and alterations to existing dwelling along with proposed garage building.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was carried out by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the site and surrounding landscape.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site is situated on the north side of New Road, a small access road separated from the A522 following the formation of a new, raised junction serving the A50. The site is a large spacious plot containing a two-storey linear dwelling, part clad in timber and set perpendicular to the road. There are also some small timber structures to the rear of the site. As such from a distance the large open site somewhat blends into the surrounding area which is largely characterised by open fields. The site and New Road are set significantly lower than the new junction which appeared, from my site visit, to be comparable with the height of the dwelling. At a distance from the site to the west is a significant warehouse/industrial complex.
5. The proposed extension would project off the north elevation of the host dwelling at right angles. This would result in an L-shape which would be jarring with the simple form of the dwelling, this is exacerbated by the massing of the proposal. Moreover, the massing of the extension would not be in keeping with

the long, narrow nature of the dwelling. The proposed roof would not respect the more traditional, smaller and considerably steeper main roof due to its shallow form. I also find that the proposed dormers, by way of their scale and proportions, would be a jarring feature compared to the much smaller existing dormers. This is especially the case for the north facing dormer serving the master bedroom which is out of proportion with the scale of the rest of the building. Although limited cues have been taken from the host dwelling, primarily regarding materials, this is not sufficient to outweigh the harm identified above.

6. The proposed garage would be a substantial building which would stretch across the majority of the front of the site where it would be prominent in views from New Road and an intrusive feature within the landscape. Although the first floor would be within the roof space, the overall height of the building would still compete with the height of the host dwelling. Moreover, the height of the roof would result in the building having an unbalanced appearance, exacerbating its bulky size and its dominance within views. As the garage would be viewed from the north-west along the A522 the proposed dormers would be seen from the side, intensifying the apparent bulk of the building.
7. While I note the proposed hedgerow, this would do little to screen the garage from public views. I also find that rather than screen views, the raised junction could instead provide an elevated viewpoint where any visual impact of the garage would be greatly increased.
8. In light of the above, the proposals before me would not be modest, and would not retain the identity of the host dwelling, nor respect its surroundings. As such the proposals would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and landscape contrary to Policies SP1, SP8, SP24, DP1 and DP3 East Staffordshire Borough Council Local Plan and Policy E2 of the Uttoxeter Neighbourhood Plan. Collectively these policies, require development to be of a high quality design that is appropriate for its location and protects the landscape.

Other Matters

9. I note that the appellant requires the garage for the dry storage of his cars and to provide an office space. Whilst I have no doubt that this would be of benefit to the appellant, it is likely that the development is permanent and would remain long after the current personal circumstances cease to exist. I therefore give these matters little weight in the determination of this appeal. While there may have previously been similarly sized outbuildings on the site, these have been removed and I must assess the site as it stands.
10. Moreover, although there are no neighbouring properties to either see the site, or be affected by it, this does not outweigh the harm identified above. Likewise, I noted the large warehouse/industrial complex to the west of the site and although this is not characteristic of the otherwise rural landscape it does not set a precedent for harmful development.
11. The proposal would not generate additional traffic, but this does not alter my findings on harm to character and appearance.

Recommendation

12. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

S Watson

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

13. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and concur that the appeal should be dismissed.

Mike Worden

INSPECTOR