
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 February 2015

by Nick Fagan BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 27 February 2015

Appeal Ref: APP/R3325/D/14/2223238

Elm Cottage, Chessels Lane, Charlton Adam, Somerton, Somerset TA11 7BJ

- 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 Mark Cooper against the decision of South Somerset District Council.
 - The application Ref 14/01001/FUL, dated 4 March 2014, was refused by notice dated 18 June 2014.
 - The development proposed is a first floor extension above existing ground floor single storey element.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a first floor extension above existing ground floor single storey element at Elm Cottage, Chessels Lane, Charlton Adam, Somerton, Somerset TA11 7BJ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 14/01001/FUL, dated 4 March 2014, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved drawings: p641/002, p641/007, p641/008, p641/009, p641/010, p641/011 & p641/013.
 - 3) No development shall take place until samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The Local Planning Authority and Parish Council object only to the proposed material to be used on the external face of the extension, namely standing seam profiled metal.
4. The front of Elm Cottage is faced with grey stone and the various rear extensions with reconstituted grey stone. Neighbouring dwellings on this part

- of Chessels Lane are also mainly faced in reconstituted stone, including the immediate neighbours and the houses on the opposite side of the Lane.
5. Oblique views of the proposed extension would be possible from the street through the gap between Elm Cottage and its immediate neighbour but it would not be prominent in the street scene, not least because the colour of the cladding is shown as being similar to that of the stone and reconstituted stone already existing.
 6. Although the grey metal cladding proposed would be different from the reconstituted stone on Elm Cottage and its neighbours I see no reason why it would be unacceptable on the proposed rear extension. It is not unusual for extensions to be faced in different materials to that of the main dwelling and the materials proposed would be acceptable in principle in this case.
 7. The appellants have pointed out that metal cladding has been used on the roof and part of the walls of the nearby Charltons' Community Centre, which is in a more prominent location. I saw that building but do not consider it justifies the materials in this case because it was clearly constructed some time ago and its context and use is completely different and therefore irrelevant. However, the appellants also state that the materials they intend to use would in any case be more attractive and I am aware that there are a number of such metal cladding products currently available on the market that would be much more acceptable in appearance than the cladding on the Community Centre.
 8. I therefore conclude that, subject to a condition requiring specific details of the actual metal cladding to be used to face the walls and roof of the extension to be approved by the Council prior to development commencing, the proposal would be acceptable within its context and would not harm the character or appearance of the area. A condition, as suggested by the Council, is also necessary listing the approved drawings in the interests of good planning and for the avoidance of doubt.
 9. 'Saved' Policies ST5 and ST6 of the South Somerset Local Plan together require development to respect the character and appearance of the locality and the proposal would do so for the above reasons. It therefore complies with these Policies.
 10. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed, subject to the above conditions.

Nick Fagan

INSPECTOR