



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 August 2023

by L Hughes BA (Hons) MTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 September 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/B3410/D/23/3324959

Rose Acre, St. Michaels Road, Stramshall, Staffordshire ST14 5AH

- 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 Adam Taylor Construction Ltd. against the decision of East Staffordshire Borough Council.
 - The application Ref P/2023/00413, dated 6 April 2023, was refused by notice dated 21 June 2023.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a detached triple garage with annex above.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a detached triple garage with annex above at Rose Acre, St. Michaels Road, Stramshall, Staffordshire ST14 5AH in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P/2023/00413, dated 6 April 2023, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans subject to compliance with other conditions of this permission:

Drawing No.s: PL(0)01 Rev B Proposed Site Layout dated as received on 1 June 2023;

Drawing No.s: PL(0)02 Rev A Proposed Floor Plan dated as received on 1 June 2023;

Drawing No.s: PL(0)03 Rev A Proposed Elevations dated as received on 1 June 2023;

Drawing No.s: PL(0)04 Location Plan and Existing Site Layout dated as received on 6 April 2023.
 - 3) The annex hereby permitted shall not be occupied at any time other than for purposes ancillary to the residential use of the dwelling known as Rose Acre and shall not be severed from the main house as a separate and unconnected dwelling.
 - 4) The external materials to be used in the development hereby permitted shall be in strict accordance with those specified in the application.

Preliminary Matters

2. Amended plans were submitted to the Council during the application determination period. The Council's decision was therefore made on the basis of the following plans: PL(0)01 Rev B, PL(0)02 Rev A, PL(0)03 Rev A and PL(0)04. I have determined this appeal based on these plans.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The proposed development relates to a detached dwelling, Rose Acre, which lies within the village of Stramshall outside defined settlement boundaries. The property is set on a large plot, elevated from the highway. Open fields lie to the north and west. To the south and east are residential properties.
5. Policy SP1 of the East Staffordshire Local Plan (ESLP) seeks a sustainable approach to development. This is supplemented by Policy SP8 that relates specifically to development outside settlement boundaries, and amongst other things, that development is otherwise appropriate in the countryside together with associated design expectations. In that light, and of relevance to the proposal, Policy DP3 of the ESLP permits extensions to existing dwellings outside of settlement boundaries in specific circumstances. This includes that buildings for uses ancillary to the dwelling are modest and designed specifically for that purpose. In comparison to a typical residential garage, the proposal is certainly not small, as it would consist of a triple garage at ground level and an annex at first floor level with a lounge, dining room, kitchen, bathroom and bedroom. However, the term 'modest' is not specifically defined and as such I have considered the proposal in relation to the plot size and the host dwelling.
6. Rose Acre is a detached property set within a spacious plot. The property has recently been granted planning permission for a substantial extension, which would see its ridge line raised and its footprint increased in size from 117m² square metres to 159m². In comparison, the proposed outbuilding would have a footprint of 72m². The proposal would have a ridge height which would be lower than both the existing dwelling and the approved extended dwelling.
7. The appellant has provided details of larger outbuildings than that proposed, that have been considered as modest by the same local authority and granted approval. I have no details of the host properties or plot sizes that these applications related to, and I have determined this appeal on its own merits. Notwithstanding this, I consider that despite its size, the proposal would be smaller in height, scale and mass and therefore subservient and modest in relation to both the existing residential dwelling and its proposed extension and would not conflict with Policy DP3 of the ESLP.
8. The proposed development would be set on an elevated position towards the front of the site and would therefore be visible from the surrounding area. The proposal would be most visible when viewed from the east. However, the impact would be lessened from this direction due to the pattern of development along St. Michaels Road, which comprises of residential properties providing a more built-up street scene on the approach to and from the village. The southern and western boundaries of the site are currently well screened with

established mature landscaping. Whilst I acknowledge that this landscaping could be removed, I am not convinced that the impact would be so severe as to render the development unacceptable in terms of its effect on the character and appearance of the area. The proposed development, although visible, would not be an incongruous addition to the prevailing character of the area and would not result in harm to visual amenity.

9. I therefore conclude that the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the area. As such, it would accord with Policy DP3 of the ESLP which requires extensions to dwellings outside settlement boundaries to be modest in relation to the original dwelling, and Policies SP1, SP8, SP24 and DP1 of the ESLP which seek to ensure good design which makes a positive contribution and is visually well related in terms of shape, volume and arrangements of the buildings to the proposed site and area. I also find no conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which aims to achieve well designed places.

Conditions

10. I have had regard to the conditions suggested by the Council, as well as to the Framework and Planning Practice Guidance insofar as they relate to the use of conditions. In addition to the standard condition which limits the lifespan of the planning condition, I have specified the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt. A condition relating to materials is necessary to ensure that the external appearance of the building would be satisfactory. I have included a condition regarding the occupancy of the annex to ensure that the additional accommodation is not severed from the main dwelling to prevent conflict with Policy SP8 of the East Staffordshire Local Plan.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

L Hughes

INSPECTOR