
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 May 2017

by M Aqbal BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 6 July 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/B3410/D/17/3173239

24 Barton Gate, Barton under Needwood, Burton on Trent, Staffordshire DE13 8AG

- 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 David Delves against the decision of East Staffordshire Borough Council.
 - The application Ref P/2017/00065, dated 16 January 2017, was refused by notice dated 13 March 2017.
 - The development proposed is described as 'extension to form store'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for extension to form store at 24 Barton Gate, Barton under Needwood, Burton on Trent, Staffordshire DE13 8AG in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P/2017/00065 dated 16 January 2017, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Location Map, Block Plan, Drawing No DD/1 and Drawing No DD/2.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in materials to match those on the existing garage.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. No 24 has been extended with a two storey side extension and also has a detached double garage to the front of the plot. The proposed extension would link these two elements.
4. I concur with the Council that the location where the extension would be built provides a visual break, which would be lost. However, there are only limited public views of this area due to the position of the detached garage. Furthermore, it is of limited visual value as it is fenced off at the front and, in

part, is viewed against the backdrop of the adjacent dwelling (No 22). As such, the loss of this visual break in my opinion would not be significant.

5. Along its only publicly visible elevation (front), the extension would not exceed the width or height of the existing garage and would also remain subordinate in height to the original dwelling. The proposed extension would follow the form and design of the existing garage. I therefore consider the extension to be modest in scale and sympathetically designed. Even in combination with the existing extensions, it would not detract from the proportions of the original dwelling. I am also mindful that the proposed extension would only be viewed from limited vantage points.
6. I note the Council's concerns that the proposed extension would relate poorly with the existing dwelling, as it would intersect at the point where the two storey side extension is set back. The section of the two storey extension where the proposed extension would mainly be attached to has no fenestration or other features that would interact awkwardly with the proposed extension. In my opinion, it would be easy to assimilate the new extension with this. Also, the shallow roof design of the proposed extension would still allow part of the set back on the two storey extension to be seen. Therefore, the proposed extension would be sensitively and harmoniously integrated with the existing dwelling.
7. With respects to the surrounding area, this comprises ribbon development within a rural setting. Nearby dwellings are predominantly detached in a range of sizes and designs. As I have already explained, I consider the proposed extension to be acceptable in terms of scale and design. It therefore follows that the proposed extension would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the wider rural location.
8. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the proposed development would not harm the character or appearance of the dwelling and surrounding area. Therefore, I find no conflict with the design aims of Policies SP1, SP24 and DP3 of the East Staffordshire Borough Council Local Plan or the East Staffordshire Design Guide – Supplementary Planning Document.

Other Matters

9. I am aware that Barton Parish Council has expressed concern, that the loss of the area of the proposed extension may compromise vehicle manoeuvring on site. However, this area is fenced off and cannot be used by vehicles in any event.

Conditions

10. In addition to the standard condition which limits the lifespan of the planning permission I have also specified the approved plans as this provides certainty. A condition relating to materials is necessary to ensure that the appearance of the extension would be satisfactory.

11. Barton Parish Council has suggested a condition to restrict the residential occupation of the proposed extension. However, based on the information before me, I am not persuaded that such a condition is required.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons set out above, I allow this appeal.

M Aqbal

INSPECTOR