
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 June 2019

by E Griffin LLB Hons

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9th July 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/K3415/D/19/3224478

19 Maple Close, Burntwood, West Midlands WS7 4RP

- 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 Stephen Holmes against the decision of Lichfield District Council.
 - The application Ref 19/00052/FULH dated 24 December 2018 was refused by notice dated 11 March 2019.
 - The development proposed is extension of domestic dwelling with two storey side, single storey rear (part), raising ridge line to accommodate a room in the roof and reskinning the front elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Procedural Matter

3. A number of plans were submitted with the original application and some plans were subsequently superseded following discussions with the Council. In the interests of clarity, the plans numbered 1, 2, 3, 7A, 8A, 9A, 10A, 11A, 12A, 15, 18 together with the Site Location Plan, Existing Block Plan and Proposed Block Plan were considered by the Council in determining the application and form part of this appeal.

Reasons

4. Dwellings on Maple Close are largely made up of two storey houses or bungalows. There is a mix of both hipped and gable roof styles on houses but they are largely of a simple design. The appeal dwelling is a two storey detached house with an adjoining single storey garage and a hipped roof. There are two storey detached houses either side of the appeal dwelling each with a single storey garage element at the side and gable roofs. There are bungalows opposite the appeal dwelling.
5. The appeal proposal would add a two storey extension where the garage is currently situated to create more habitable rooms. It would also add a single storey extension to the rear with a monopitched roof and the existing main roof

would be changed from hipped to gable to accommodate a loft conversion. Two dormer windows would be added at the front and one at the back. A porch and roof lights are also shown on the plans.

6. The proposed alterations to the main roof would not increase the overall height of the dwelling but together with the two storey side extension would add mass at the front. The flat roof part of the new gable roof with dormer windows would draw the eye to the increased roof mass. The two storey side extension would not be subservient as it would extend beyond the front of the existing dwelling and the eaves height of the extension would be higher than the eaves height of the existing dwelling.
7. The combination of the various elements particularly the roof design, the two storey side extension and the dormer windows would result in an over dominant and incongruous form of development that would not be in keeping with the surrounding area.
8. The appeal proposal would therefore harm the character and appearance of the area due to the scale, massing and siting. It would therefore be contrary to Policy BE1 of the Lichfield District Local Plan Strategy 2008-2029 Adopted 17 February 2015 (the Local Plan Strategy) which, amongst other things, states that new development including extensions should carefully respect the character of the surrounding area and development in terms of layout, scale and size. It would also be contrary to Core Policy 3 of the Local Plan Strategy which, amongst other things, states that development should be of a scale and nature appropriate to the locality. It would also be contrary to the principles of good design set out in the National Planning Policy Framework.

Other Matters

9. The appellant has met with the Council to discuss the application and has had email exchanges and believes that he has sought to address points raised and has made various amendments. The appellant considers that all of his proposals have been in keeping with the existing street scene. However, I have not found that to be the case with the appeal proposal.
10. Photographs have been supplied of other dwellings that illustrate individual elements of the appeal proposal. However, each application has to be assessed on its own particular merits. Whilst photographs of dormer elements have been provided, two examples are of bungalows and the third is in a different street. Although No 21 Maple Close which is next to the appeal dwelling has a stepped forward element, it is single storey. Although photographs relating to mass of brick work have been supplied, the submission of later plans mean that issue is not before me. I do not therefore find any of the examples provided to be directly comparable to the appeal proposal.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given, the appeal is dismissed.

E Griffin

INSPECTOR