



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 June 2019

by Julie Dale Clark BA (Hons) DipTP MCD DMS MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2nd September 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/K3415/D/19/3227943

59 Brook End, Longdon, Rugeley, Staffs WS15 4PP

- 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 Nathan Lindley against the decision of Lichfield District Council.
 - The application Ref 19/00099/FULH, dated 14 January 2019, was refused by notice dated 5 March 2019.
 - The development proposed is proposed first floor front extension & revision to pitch roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. I consider that the main issue is the effect of the front extension on the character and appearance of the area and on the dwelling itself.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a semi-detached white rendered house in a prominent roadside location fronting Brook End, close to the junction with Swan Close. It is not a listed building nor is it in a conservation area. However, the Council consider that it is a non-designated heritage asset due to its age but there is nothing in the appeal documents that indicate the age of the property. It is an attractive property but I am unclear as to the background which has resulted in the house being determined as a heritage asset. The Staffordshire Historic Environment Record is referred to in the Council SPD¹ as containing details of non-designated historic assets but a copy of it has not been submitted.
4. The National Planning Policy Framework² refers to the effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset, advising that in weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect a non-designated heritage asset, a balanced judgement will be required. Local Plan³ Core Policy 14 and Policy BE1 also refer to the significance of the historic environment.
5. Notwithstanding the heritage significance of the appeal site, it is an attractive, traditional domestic property in a prominent location. It is relatively simple in

¹ Historic Environment Supplementary Planning Document, December 2015 (SPD).

² Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government Planning Policy Framework, July 2018 (the Framework).

³ Lichfield District Local Plan Strategy 2008 – 2029, Adopted 17 February 2015.

its form and incorporates a sloping roofed front projection. The proposal would extend above this and introduce a prominent gable feature to the front of the house. This would be at odds with the horizontal character of the dwelling and although gables feature to the front of properties in the area, the introduction of this vertical element would conflict with the design and style of the existing dwelling. Given its prominent roadside location, this would also have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the area. The revision to the single storey pitched roof is relatively minor and I have no objections to this element.

6. Core Policy 3 seeks to protect the character and distinctiveness of the Lichfield District and its settlements, amongst other things. In addition to its reference to the historic environment, Policy BE1 and Policy 4 of the Neighbourhood Plan⁴ also require new development to respect the character of the surrounding area in terms of the built vernacular. For the reasons set out above, the proposed extension would conflict with these policies.
7. I have considered all matters raised but none alter my conclusion. I conclude that the front extension would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area and on the dwelling itself. This would conflict with the policies referred to and therefore the appeal fails.

J D Clark

INSPECTOR

⁴ Longdon Parish Neighbourhood Plan 2017-2029, Made 08 October 2018.