



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 9 August 2021 by B Phillips BSc MSc MRTPI

Decision by L McKay MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 November 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/D0121/D/21/3271619

7 Hillview Avenue, Clevedon, Somerset BS21 6JG

- 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 Rafal Madzelewski against the decision of North Somerset Council.
 - The application Ref 20/P/2791/FUH, dated 4 November 2020, was refused by notice dated 24 February 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as, "Erection of a single storey steel shed. No foundation, no windows, one door. Shed in the corner of the plot."
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

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

Preliminary Matters

3. I saw at my site visit that a shed had been erected on site which accords with the plans before me, therefore I have considered the appeal on the basis that the development has already taken place. The appellant has stated that it would be possible to move the shed or to construct it from a differing material, however the appeal process should not be used to evolve a scheme and it is important that I consider the scheme that was before the Council, which interested parties have had the opportunity to comment on. It is of course open for the appellant to make an further application for a revised scheme.
4. The Government published on 20 July 2021 a revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). The issues most relevant to this appeal are unaffected by the revisions, therefore I am satisfied that there is no requirement to seek further submissions on the revised Framework, and that no party would be disadvantaged by such a course of action.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the shed on the character and appearance of the appeal property and surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

6. Hillview Avenue is a suburban street made up mostly of consistent semi-detached or terraced dwellings set back from the road with off street parking. Front gardens are, save for low walls, largely open to the street with some landscaping which serves to visually soften the built form.
7. The appeal property is a mid-terraced dwelling. The shed sits close to the front boundary and forward of any other building. Although the side is partially screened by a hedge, the front and rear elevations are prominently visible from the street and its visual impact is heightened by its dark colour and use of steel. As a result, it appears stark and conspicuous and dominant and obtrusive in the street scene. It detracts from the frontage of the appeal property and is at odds with the open character of the terrace frontage.
8. There are other sheds visible in the vicinity, however these are sited to the rear or side of properties, not adjacent to the front boundary or clearly forward of a building line. As such, they are not as visually obvious and prominent in the street scene as the appeal scheme, so their visual impact is consequently not comparable.
9. I acknowledge that the shed provides secure storage for bikes, motorbikes and equipment for maintaining the front garden, and that this is convenient for the occupiers as the property has no direct external access to the rear garden. However, due to its siting, scale and materials the shed is harmful to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area, and this harm is not outweighed by the private benefits to the occupiers.
10. Consequently, the development conflicts with Policies CS12 of the North Somerset Council Core Strategy and Policies DM32 and DM38 of the North Somerset Council Development Management Policies Sites and Policies Plan Part 1 which collectively require development to be of a high standard of design and respect the characteristics of the site. It also conflicts with the guidance on outbuildings in Section 2 of the Council's Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document.

Conclusion and Recommendation

11. There are no material considerations, including the benefits of the proposal that indicate the proposal should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. For the reasons given above, I therefore recommend that the appeal should not succeed.

B Phillips

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

12. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

L McKay

INSPECTOR