



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 May 2023

by F Rafiq BSc (Hons) MCD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 May 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/B3410/W/22/3311347

Kingstanding Hall, Burton Road, Needwood, Staffordshire DE13 9PE

- 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 Andrew Woodward (Kingstanding Developments Limited) against the decision of East Staffordshire Borough Council.
 - The application Ref P/2022/01005, dated 16 August 2022, was refused by notice dated 19 October 2022.
 - The development proposed is covered electric vehicle charging bays and bin store to serve units 7 to 11 Kingstanding Hall.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site is situated close to a group of buildings, including a residential development scheme to convert stables to create five dwellings. These are situated in a rural area and surrounded by fields and other open areas of land. The gently undulating topography and the boundary treatments to surrounding fields, which generally comprise of planting and open timber fencing, provide for far reaching views that give the area a verdant, spacious character, typical of a countryside setting.
4. The appellant has set out that the architectural design of the proposal has followed the existing stables, including its external detailing and in the use of materials. The height of the proposed car port has been influenced by providing a roof pitch to match the existing buildings. I also note the various comparisons that have been made, including with Grooms Cottage, but the height of the proposed car port, when combined with its long linear form, would result in a building with a considerable massing.
5. The narrow gable of the car port would face the drive, but in other views, the length and scale of the building would be apparent. I note the appeal site is accessed by a private drive, but the proposal would nevertheless be seen in views from nearby buildings and fields. Whilst remote parking is not necessarily unusual in courtyard developments, in this rural area, despite the presence of nearby buildings, the siting of the car port proposed would not make a positive

contribution, but would rather adversely impact the verdant, spacious character of the area.

6. The proposed bin store, although a smaller structure than the proposed car port building, it would be situated away from the properties it would serve and closer to the access drive. Whilst the location may be convenient as a collection point, it would also appear as an incongruous addition in a prominent location.
7. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the area. As such, it would conflict with Strategic Policy 8, Strategic Policy 24 and Detailed Policy 3 of the East Staffordshire Local Plan, which seek, amongst other matters, the design of a building, including its massing, are visually well-related to the proposed site and its setting. It would also be contrary to the Re-use of Redundant Rural Buildings Supplementary Planning Document and Paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which seek development that is sympathetic to local character. The decision notice references the East Staffordshire Design Guide, but I have not been provided with details of this document.

Other Matters

8. My attention has been drawn to the planning history of nearby developments by the main parties and the relationship of the appeal proposal to it. I have however determined the appeal before me on its own merits.
9. The proposal would not adversely affect the living conditions of nearby occupiers in terms of overshadowing or outlook. There would also be no harmful heritage impacts arising and the regular collection from the refuse and recycling store would address the risk from vermin. Rainwater from the proposed development would be addressed by discharging into soakaways. These are however neutral matters and not ones which weigh in its favour.
10. I note the demand for covered parking on the appeal site and the appeal proposal would provide electric vehicle charging points. The Council has however stated that the electric charging facilities could be provided to the parking areas within the curtilage of each residential unit that the proposal intends to serve. Given the siting and scale of the proposed car port, I consider it would be more visually harmful than the parking of vehicles in an open area.
11. The appellant has also stated that the area of the proposal would serve no useful purpose and will be vacant following the completion of construction. However, from the information before me, this area would have been partly occupied by a refuse and recycle store, positioned closer to the residential conversion scheme than the bin store forming part of the appeal development. These matters therefore attract limited weight in favour of the proposal.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, having considered the development plan as a whole, the approach in the Framework, and all other relevant material considerations, the appeal is dismissed.

F Rafiq

INSPECTOR