
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 November 2016

by Beverley Doward BSc BTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 21 November 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/B3410/D/16/3158899

Green Acres, Radmore Lane, Staffordshire, Abbots Bromley, WS15 3AS

- 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 John Thorndyke against the decision of East Staffordshire Borough Council.
 - The application Ref P/2016/00956, dated 12 July 2016, was refused by notice dated 26 August 2016.
 - The development proposed is described as 'erection of part two storey, part single storey rear extension, part single storey, part first floor link extension and first floor extension over existing garage, including the installation of a bio disc sewage treatment plant. (Amended Scheme)'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of part two storey, part single storey rear extension, part single storey, part first floor link extension and first floor extension over existing garage, including the installation of a bio disc sewage treatment plant at Green Acres, Radmore Lane, Staffordshire, Abbots Bromley, WS15 3AS in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P/2016/00956, dated 12 July 2016, 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 plans: drawing nos. 1508-P1 B, 1508-P5 B, 1508-P4 A, 1508-P6 B and 1508-P7 B.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of development in the heading above is taken from the planning application form. I have removed those aspects of the description which are not development from my formal decision.

Background and Main Issue

3. Planning permission was granted for a similar scheme of extensions to that the subject of this appeal in April 2016. The appeal proposal differs to the approved scheme only in respect of the design of the front dormer windows
-

proposed as part of the first floor extension and the Council's reason for refusal relates only to the front dormer windows. Therefore, the main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area having regard to the design of the proposed dormer windows.

Reasons

4. The appeal site comprises a detached two storey dwelling within a rural area. The existing dwelling is linked to a large single storey garage by a small link structure. It is sited about 10m back from the road frontage in an extensive garden, the frontage of which is delineated by a hedge.
5. The appeal proposal comprises a scheme of extensions which includes a part two storey, part single storey rear extension, part first floor link extension and first floor extension over the existing garage, including the installation of a bio disc sewage treatment plant. The Council does not object to the principle of the scheme of extensions which it considers to be proportionate to the size of the dwelling and I see no reason to take an alternative view.
6. The previously approved scheme of extensions included two flat roofed dormer windows on the front of the first floor extension above the garage. In the appeal proposal the proposed dormer windows on the front of the first floor extension above the garage would have hipped roofs. There are no other hipped roof elements to the front of the property. However, there are also no other flat roof elements. The dormer windows would be of a relatively modest scale and the ridge of the hipped roofs would be set down from the ridge of the roof of the first floor extension above the garage. Accordingly, the hipped roof dormer windows would not appear as either disproportionate additions to the property or overly dominant features within the streetscape.
7. The drawings and information submitted with the planning application indicate that the roofs will be covered with plain tiles with bonnet hips in the same colour and finish as the concrete pantiles on the main roof. Accordingly, they would be sympathetic to the host building and would appear simple and visually unobtrusive.
8. Taking into account all of the above therefore, I consider that the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the host building or the surrounding area having regard to the design of the proposed dormer windows. Accordingly, it would not conflict with Strategic Policy 24 of the East Staffordshire Borough Council Local Plan 2012-2031 (Local Plan) or the East Staffordshire Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) which together seek to ensure that development proposals contribute positively to the area in which they are proposed and do not detract from the character of the host building or the streetscape.
9. The proposed development would comply with Detailed Policy 1 of the Local Plan which indicates that planning permission will normally be granted for development which responds positively to the context of the surrounding area, exhibits a high quality of design and is compliant with the East Staffordshire Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). Furthermore, in so far as Detailed Policy 3 of the Local Plan refers to the need for extensions to be compliant with the SPD, it would also comply with that policy.

Conditions

10. As well as the standard time limit condition, a condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans is necessary to provide certainty. A condition requiring the proposal to be constructed in materials matching those used in the existing house is also necessary to ensure a satisfactory appearance.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Beverley Doward

INSPECTOR