

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 July 2019

by Steven Hartley BA (Hons) Dist.TP (Manc) DMS MRTPI MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State.

Decision date: 18th July 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/Y3425/D/19/3230299

131 Cannock Road, Stafford ST17 0QL

- 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 and Mrs Scott against the decision of Stafford Borough Council.
 - The application, Ref 19/29860/HOU dated 7 January 2019, was refused by notice dated 20 March 2019.
 - The development proposed is for a garage extension and conversion with extension over to create new bedroom following approval of 18/29095/HOU.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for a garage extension and conversion with extension over to create a new bedroom at 131 Cannock Road, Stafford ST17 0QL in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 19/29860/HOU dated 7 January 2019, subject to the following conditions:
 - i. the development hereby permitted shall begin no later than three years from the date of this decision;
 - ii. the development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: RCS-001, RCS-006 REV A, RCS-003, RCS-005, RCS-002 and RCS-004;
 - iii. and the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Procedural Matter

2. Since the submission of the appeal, an updated version of the National Planning Policy Framework (February 2019) (the Framework) has been published by the Government. This is a material consideration in planning decisions. In relation to the main issue in this appeal, Government policy has not materially changed, and it was not therefore necessary to invite any further comments from the different parties involved.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the building and the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal relates to a two storey brick built, detached dwellinghouse in a residential area comprising detached and semi-detached houses of different designs but which are mainly two storeys in height. All are located in a leafy setting. The appeal property, like most of the houses in the immediate area, has a relatively long front garden which fronts the road.
5. The dwelling includes an integrated single storey garage with a flat roof: the proposal is to extend it by approximately 1.1 metres to the boundary of the curtilage, to convert it to a playroom and to construct a bedroom above it at first floor level. The first floor extension would also be constructed up to the boundary of the curtilage. No openings are proposed to the side elevation of the extension.
6. There is an extant permission for a two storey extension in the same location¹. This includes an extension to the existing garage and to the curtilage boundary, but the first floor extension would be set in from the boundary.
7. The existing dwelling is not symmetrical in its design and I find that the proposed development would not create an unbalanced appearance, nor would it be incongruous or overly prominent in the street scene: other houses in the immediate vicinity are of various designs and all are set well back from the access road. Furthermore, the difference between the extant planning approval and the appeal proposal would have only limited significance in terms of the impact on the character and appearance of the dwelling and on the street scene.
8. The Council's Design Supplementary Planning Document (2018) (SPD) opposes extensions 'if they result in creating a harmful terracing effect, though it gives no details as to the reasons for any such harm. The SPD advises that, wherever possible, an existing side access to the rear garden should be retained. There is no such entrance to the side where the development is proposed but there is such a rear entrance on the other side of the dwelling.
9. The existing dwelling has a steeply pitched roof to the rear of the flat roofed garage. The proposed extension would be little different in its overall height to that of the steeply pitched roof and it would close the gap between it and the adjoining property by approximately 1.1 metres. Moreover, the extant approval permits the extension at ground floor level to be constructed by such a distance. I therefore find that the narrowing of the gap between the appeal property and the dwelling adjoining it over and above the extant approval would not be so significant as to create a harmful terracing effect.
10. Furthermore, the dwelling and the adjacent houses are set well back from the public vantage point of the access road and where any such terracing effect,

¹ Application no 18/29095/HOU

even if it were to occur, would not therefore be visually significant. In addition, the proposed development, even if it were to create a terracing effect, the differing design of the appeal building and that of the adjoining property, by their diversity, would prevent the creation of an unpleasant or incongruous street scene.

11. Windows in the gable wall to the adjoining dwelling at first floor level have obscure glazing.
12. I therefore conclude that the appeal proposal would comply with the Plan for Stafford Borough (2014) (PSB) policy N1 (g to i) which aims to promote high standards of design which enhance the character of the area. Furthermore, I conclude, for the reasons stated that the aims of the SPD are met.

Conditions

13. I have imposed the standard time condition and a condition related to the approved plans for certainty. In the interests of the character and appearance of the area and to ensure an outcome of sufficient quality, I have specified that materials should match the existing building.

Conclusion

14. Taking into account all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Steven Hartley

INSPECTOR