
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 July 2024

by Eleni Randle BSc (hons) MSc FRICS FAAV MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9th August 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/C1625/D/24/3346406

Kenwin Orchard, Highfield Road, Whiteshill, Stroud, GL6 6AL

- 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 & Mrs D Asplin against Stroud District Council.
 - The application Ref is S.24/0643/HHOLD.
 - The development proposed is side and rear extensions, front dormer and enlarged first floor front window.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for side and rear extensions, front dormer and enlarged first floor front window at Kenwin Orchard, Highfield Road, Whiteshill, Stroud GL6 6AL in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref S.24/0643/HHOLD, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be commenced 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: site location plan 100, proposed floor plans 103, and proposed elevations 104 – all submitted 05.04.2024;
 - 3) Prior to their installation/use on site, full details of materials to be utilised for the external surfaces of the building works hereby permitted, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall then only be carried in accordance with the approved details.

Procedural Matters

2. The appellant's documentation refers to application S.22/2772/HOLD with the appellant requesting, by email after submission of the appeal on 19 June 2024, that the reference on the appeal forms (S.24/0643/HHOLD) is substituted for S.22/2772/HHOLD. Case officers have checked the reference for S.22/2772/HHOLD which relates to an application that was approved in February 2023. The appeal before me was submitted on 14 June 2024 so any appeal connected with S.22/2772/HHOLD would have been out of time and unable to proceed on a procedural basis.
3. Based upon these facts, as confirmed with case officers, and for the avoidance of doubt, I have determined the appeal before me against the refusal set out within S.24/0643/HHOLD dated 31 May 2024 (the date also noted, in terms of a decision date, within 1.1 of the appellant's statement).

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the impact of the proposal upon the street scene and character of the surroundings of the host dwelling.

Reasons

5. The appeal site is a detached, three-storey, dwelling benefitting from approval of a previous application, for a similar scheme, under reference S.22/2772/HHOLD. The proposal before me seeks permission as a resubmission of this permission. Based upon the documentation before me the key changes, between the previous approval and the proposals which are the subject of this appeal, would be the addition of a lean-to, pitched, zinc roof to the single storey extensions, a larger canopy off the extension and a reduction in size of two window openings. The principle of the development, in terms of extensions to the property, are therefore considered acceptable and the main consideration within this appeal is the impact of the proposal as a result of the addition of a metal standing seam roof over the single storey extension, as well as the addition of a lean-to pitch. It is understood that the previous approval allowed a flat roofed extension.
6. At the time of my site visit I found that the character, and appearance, of dwellings along Highfield Road and in the general locality was highly varied. The appeal site would be visible from within the street scene, however, general views would, to some extent, be partly obscured by the detached garage/outbuilding which stands forward of the host dwelling with any views of the proposal being from an angle on the approach to the appeal site from Highfield Road itself. Such views I find would be viewed against a backdrop of further built form as a result of views through to both Willesdon Cottages and the property known as Applegarth to the rear. I do not, therefore, find that the addition of what is ultimately a shallow pitch would make the extension more visible in the street scene nor would it give the impression of additional massing which would be sufficient to warrant refusal.
7. The proposals would be set back from the public highway and given this, and the difference in site levels between the host dwelling and the road itself, the extension would be appropriate for the context of the three-storey dwelling. The proposal would not immediately attract attention and would, I find, be comparable in visual impact to the existing permission which is in place. I feel that this is well illustrated by the side-by-side comparisons of the plans in question within figure 2 of the appellant's statement of case.
8. In relation to the utilisation of standing seam metal/metal cladding I note that the existing planning permission was granted with the plans clearly noting metal cladding to the new dormers to the front elevation. The officer's report went on to acknowledge metal clad sides outlining that the modern appearance of the house made the use of such materials not unacceptable as a result of a mixture of housing styles, including ones with dormers, in the local vernacular. Given the varied materials, and character of the surrounding area, I do not find that the use of seam metal as proposed by the appellant within the revised scheme to be inappropriate. The dwelling itself is, compared to neighbouring properties, relatively contemporary in design with the appellant providing examples of utilisation of similar materials to the proposal that is before me within the locality. The utilisation of sustainable, modern materials is not, in this case, unacceptable and I find that the addition of a pitched roof as well as

the use of standing seam metal to be appropriate to the character of the host dwelling, the character of the surroundings as well as not appearing more prominent in the street scene.

9. Overall, I find the addition of a pitched roof to the already approved single storey extension as well as the use of standing seam metal to not appear more prominent in the street scene than the already approved scheme. The proposed materials are not uncharacteristic in the locality, and I do not find that the proposal would appear out of character with the surroundings of the host dwelling. The proposal would be consistent with Stroud District Local Plan 2015 (LP) Policy HC8(2) which requires that extensions to dwellings must ensure that the design is in keeping with the scale and character of the original dwelling and the sites wider setting and location. Proposals should also respect the appearance of the site and the local area.

Conditions

10. The Council have suggested four conditions in the event this appeal is allowed which I have considered. A time condition is attached to comply with Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. A condition requiring the development to be in accordance with the approved plans is required to control and define the development which is granted consent. A condition relating to materials, to be approved prior to installation on site, is required to ensure an appropriate finish with further details as to the exact metal and external materials proposed.
11. I note a condition is proposed relating to control of delivery timings, the requirements of LP Policy ES3 as well as the site's residential context, however, when taking into account the limited scale of the proposals I find the construction timings and main deliveries required would realistically be short term in the context of the lifetime of the development. Whilst such conditions may be appropriate for larger proposals, I have no real evidence before me to suggest or support that this condition is fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development, particularly in relation to the suggested timing controls from Monday to Friday and, for this reason, I have not applied the condition that has been suggested.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons outlined above, and taking account all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed subject to conditions.

Eleni Randle

INSPECTOR