



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 May 2022

by K Savage BA(Hons) MPlan MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 May 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/G4240/D/22/3293420

17 Beaconsfield Terrace, Castle Lane, Stalybridge SK15 3PE

- 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 M Buckley against the decision of Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/00751/FUL, dated 11 June 2021, was refused by notice dated 7 December 2021.
 - The development proposed is a single storey tool shed to the left side of 17 Beaconsfield Terrace.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey tool shed to the side of the dwelling, at 17 Beaconsfield Terrace, Castle Lane, Stalybridge SK15 3PE in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/00751/FUL, dated 11 June 2021, subject to the following condition:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 2020-034-001 (Elevations as Existing and Proposed); 2020-034-002 (Plans as Existing and Proposed and Block Plan).

Procedural Matters

2. The appeal is made on a partly retrospective basis. At my site visit, the single storey structure had been erected, but with a flat roof, not a pitched roof as proposed on the submitted plans. I have had regard to what has been built in reaching my decision, but have also taken account of the proposed roof details shown on the submitted plans.
3. I have made a minor change to the description of development in the formal decision in the interests of clarity and legibility.

Main Issue

4. The effect of the development on the character and appearance, and heritage significance, of the Carrbrook Conservation Area (CCA).

Reasons

5. The appeal site is an end-of-terrace stone built dwelling which faces onto a triangular open space used as a bowling green. Similar terraces of traditional, stone dwellings surround the open space and line adjacent streets. The street to the side of the dwelling is lined for a short distance by further terraced housing before continuing into the wooded countryside beyond the village. To the rear of the site is an access road running behind the terrace.

6. The site lies within the CCA, which is described by the Council as drawing its character from a linked series of open and nodal spaces, and housing whose design reflects the social hierarchy of the mill village. The appeal dwelling is noted as a higher status dwelling dating from the 1880s, part of a symmetrical terrace with projecting gable end houses. It was evident from my visit that the appeal dwelling, and surrounding dwellings, contribute positively to the significance of the CCA through their traditional design, materials and layout reflecting the historic development of the village.
7. The single storey structure has been constructed to the side of the dwelling, fronting Carr Lane. It is faced in vertical timber boarding above a block wall to the lower parts. The proposed plans indicate a shallow pitched slate roof would be added to the structure, which presently has a flat roof. The appellant further indicates an intention to cover the building with flowering and evergreen climbers, which I saw on site have been planted.
8. The Council refers to the guidance of the Tameside Residential Design Supplementary Planning Document (March 2010) (the SPD). Policy RED1 sets out that developments should apply an architectural style that reflects the existing dwelling; use materials that align with the existing in terms of size, style, colour and texture; and be subordinate to the original dwelling. Policy RED5 states that side extensions should be set back from the main elevations and side boundaries, and should have roofs in the same style as the original house. Extensions to corner plots should not detract from the street scene.
9. The structure in this case is modest in size, recessed well back from the front and rear elevations, and low in height. Consequently, it forms a subservient addition that does not have a significant effect on the overall scale and form of the host dwelling. Moreover, it does not upset the symmetry of the wider terrace, as front views of the terrace as a whole are limited by the mature trees within the open space directly opposite.
10. In terms of design, I recognise that timber is not a typical facing material for extensions within the CCA; however, neither is it wholly uncharacteristic of it, as I saw a number of visible timber fences to nearby properties. The timber, though slightly stark in appearance at the time of my visit, is expected to weather over time to a more muted colour that would enable the extension to better blend in with the stone of the main dwelling. The proposed climbing plants are not a permanent addition and could be cut back or removed, but as an additional feature they would further soften the appearance of the extension in the street scene.
11. The proposed pitched roof would effect a more traditional appearance to the structure, and although it would not exactly reflect the shape of the main roof, it would integrate the extension visually with the host dwelling, in accordance with Policy RED5. That said, I find that the structure as it exists on site, whilst not matching the materials or roof form of the main dwelling as sought by the SPD, combines a simple flat roof and high quality timber boarding in a sensitive contemporary treatment that, due to its low height and recess from the front and rear elevations, forms a complementary addition that allows the original form and character of the dwelling and wider terrace to still be appreciated.
12. In views up Carr Lane, the structure appears as a minor addition that does not intrude harmfully into the main vista towards the wooded upland beyond the village. Similarly, from Castle Lane, the extension is screened in longer views

down the street by the corner building and vegetation at No 13, only becoming visible when close to the junction, where it does not detract from the primacy of the terraces which surround the open space. Intervening trees, planting and railings also filter views of the structure from within the open space and bowling green. I find, therefore, that the structure is a neutral addition that does not adversely affect the features of the CCA which contribute to its heritage significance.

13. For these reasons, I conclude that the appeal scheme preserves the character and appearance of the CCA, and its heritage significance. No conflict therefore arises with Policies 1.11, H10 and C4 of the Tameside Unitary Development Plan (November 2004) which require high quality housing developments that compliment or enhance the character and appearance of the surrounding area; and that regard is had to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of conservation areas.

Other Matters

14. Reference is made by an interested party to the erection of a low timber fence on the side boundary wall of the appeal property. This is not shown on the submitted plans, nor does the Council refer to it in its delegated report. Therefore, I do not regard the fence as forming part of the appeal before me.
15. I note concerns that the proposal would set an undesirable precedent for development within the conservation area. Ultimately, each application must be judged on its own merits, taking account of various factors which will differ in each case depending on a site's location and the nature of the proposal. Therefore, I do not consider that a decision to allow the appeal would establish a precedent which would jeopardise the character and appearance of the conservation area.

Conditions

16. As the development has been commenced, the standard time limit condition is not required. However, as the proposed roof has not been constructed, a condition setting out the approved plans is necessary to provide certainty.

Conclusion

17. I have found that the appeal scheme accords with the development plan, taken as a whole, and material considerations do not indicate that permission should nevertheless be withheld. Therefore, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

K Savage

INSPECTOR