

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 March 2017

by K E Down MA (Oxon) MSc MRTPI MRSB

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

Decision date: 29 March 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Q1825/D/17/3167696
12 Stoke Lane, Redditch, B98 8RR

- 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 Scott Manning against the decision of Redditch Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2016/164/FUL, dated 19 May 2016, was refused by notice dated 12 December 2016.
 - The development proposed is the erection of single and two storey extensions to a dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of single and two storey extensions at 12 Stoke Lane, Redditch, B98 8RR in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2016/164/FUL, dated 19 May 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: 3012_002 Rev A.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extensions hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Procedural matter

2. The original application form and submitted plan, the Council's refusal notice and other documents refer to 12 Stoke Lane. However, the appeal form refers to 10 Stoke Lane. I am satisfied that this is a typographical error and that the appeal dwelling is No 12. I have determined the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

3. There is one main issue which is the effect of the proposed extensions on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene of Stoke Lane.
-

Reasons

4. The appeal dwelling is a modern, detached two storey dwelling located on a housing estate comprising dwellings of similar age and design. The dwelling, like many others on the estate, has a single storey pitched roof garage that extends the full depth of and is integral to the house. The proposed extension would provide first floor accommodation above the garage. The front elevation would be set back by almost 330mm from the existing first floor front elevation which is itself set back from the ground floor. The ridge of the extension would be marginally below that of the existing dwelling.
5. The width, height and bulk of the proposed extension would be in proportion to the original dwelling and the set back of the front elevation would ensure the extension appeared discrete from and subservient to the original house. The pitched roof would match that of the existing dwelling and the front window would match other first floor front windows and be aligned centrally in the extension. Overall the design of the extension would reflect the character and appearance of the host dwelling and be of an appropriate scale. It would therefore comply with the requirements of the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance, 2001, "Encouraging Good Design".
6. Although the Council suggests that the proposed extension would not reflect or compliment the local surroundings, I saw a number of similar built forms both in Stoke Lane and on adjacent streets. Some of these are clearly extensions, including one under construction at the time of my site visit, while others may form part of the original building. Either way the proposed extension would reflect existing development and be sympathetic to the local surroundings.
7. It is concluded on the main issue that the proposed extension would have no materially detrimental effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling or the street scene of Stoke Lane. In consequence it would comply with Policies 39 and 40 of the Borough of Redditch Local Plan No 4 which was adopted on 30 January 2017 and supercedes Local Plan No 3, including Policies B(BE).13 and B(BE).14 referred to in the refusal of planning permission. Taken together the extant policies expect all development to be of a good design and contribute positively to the local character of the area, responding to and integrating with the distinctive features of the surrounding environment.
8. The Council suggests two conditions in addition to the statutory commencement condition. Firstly, a condition requiring the extension to be built in accordance with the approved plans, which is necessary to give certainty. Secondly, a condition, requiring the development to be built in materials matching the exiting dwelling which is necessary to protect the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.
9. For the reasons set out above and having regard to all other matters raised I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

K E Down
INSPECTOR