



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 September 2025

by **C McDonagh BA (Hons) MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 05 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/B3438/W/25/3367539

5 Moorhead Drive, Bagnall, Staffordshire ST9 9LQ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr & Mrs Lymer against the decision of Staffordshire Moorlands District Council.
 - The application Ref is SMD/2025/0164.
 - The development proposed is elevational alterations to facing materials.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and local area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two-storey detached dwelling with red brick facing elevations and a projecting front gable. Moorhead Drive is a cul-de-sac comprising 6 dwellings in a linear formation facing the street creating a uniform front building line. The properties are generally of similar appearance and scale, with matching brick and integral garages of particular note, although No.11 located at the head of the cul-de-sac is a notable departure given its mock Tudor style weatherboarding and rendered appearance.
4. My attention is drawn to the Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (the SPD) (21 February 2018) which advises that new materials need to respect the building and its setting. Occasionally, high quality modern materials may be used as substitutes or replacements for traditional materials in exceptional circumstances where appropriate to the design or setting, provided they harmonise well. The SPD goes on to state that there is no tradition of external timber boarding in Staffordshire Moorlands, other than historically and more recently in agricultural buildings.
5. It was clear on my site visit that the predominant building material in the Moorhead Drive streetscene was red brick. The host building harmonises with the neighbouring properties in this regard, and while there are variations in some detailing between the properties, generally speaking the uniform palette of materials has created a pleasant character and strong sense of place in the streetscene.

6. The introduction of uPVC panelling of timber effect would appear incongruent set against the materials of Moorhead Drive, harmfully impacting the character and appearance of the host dwelling and across the streetscene. This incongruity would be amplified by the addition of canopies over the front door and garage which would frame the new materials, highlighting their harmful impact on the front elevation of the property and appearing prominent in the street scene. While I appreciate other properties on adjacent streets may feature more variation of materials, the cul-de-sac enclosure of Moorhead Drive strengthens this positive rhythm through the street and there is little intervisibility between these other highlighted properties and that subject to appeal to form any kind of meaningful connection. The incongruity would be experienced in isolation in the streetscene and would be harmful as a result.
7. I agree that No.11 is somewhat different, and its appearance is in stark contrast to others in terms of its materials. The incongruity is lessened somewhat by its location at the end of the cul-de-sac where it is largely enclosed, while the appeal property is located in the middle of the street, much more visible than No.11 and seen in the immediate context of adjacent red brick facing properties to either side. Moreover, there is nothing before me to indicate whether these changes were granted planning permission. As such, this does not convince me the proposal before me is acceptable on this basis, which I have assessed on its own merits.
8. There were no neighbour objections to the proposal. However, a lack of objections does not weigh in favour of the scheme. I am also advised that uPVC was chosen due to its low maintenance, durability and sustainability. Be that as it may, uPVC is a synthetic material which still requires energy to produce. While it may be prevalent in modern buildings, there is nothing before me to substantiate the claim that it is sustainable or environmentally friendly, particularly in light of the global drive to reduce the use of plastics in general.
9. Based on the foregoing, the proposal would be contrary to policy DC1 of the Staffordshire Moorlands Local Plan (adopted September 2020). This seeks to ensure that new development would be of a high quality and add value to the local area, incorporating creativity, detailing and materials appropriate to the character of the area. The proposal would also be contrary to the advice in the SPD and paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which states that developments should establish or maintain a strong sense of place, using the arrangement of streets, spaces, building types and materials to create attractive, welcoming and distinctive places to live, work and visit.

Conclusion

10. The development conflicts with the development plan as a whole and the material considerations forwarded do not indicate that a decision should be made other than in accordance with it. Therefore, for the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal is dismissed.

C McDonagh

INSPECTOR