



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 March 2020 by G Sibley MPLAN MRTPI

Decision by K Taylor BSc (Hons) PGDip MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8 April 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/B3410/D/19/3242078

10 Main Street, Branston DE14 3EX

- 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 Brady against the decision of East Staffordshire Borough Council.
 - The application Ref: P/2019/01079, dated 23 August 2019, was refused by notice dated 11 November 2019.
 - The development proposed is described on the application form as proposed roof extension and single storey reception extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The host dwelling is located on a junction between Main Street and the B5018 and is a two-storey dwelling with a rear projection that has a steep pitched roof that is pitched in the opposite direction to the main roof and is shorter than the main dwelling. The proposed roof extension would be located on the rear roof pitch that faces towards the B5018. The roof extension would accommodate the full width of the roof and would finish in line with the existing wall of the side projection. Its flat roof would be at around two thirds of the height of the pitched roof. Whilst the extension is not referred to as a dormer window, it would have the appearance of a large box dormer window.
5. There are several flat roofed outbuildings that are within the garden area for the host dwelling and on the opposite side of the road is a fast food takeaway that has a front extension with a flat roof. The public house on the opposite side of the junction has a small single storey extension around it and part of that has a flat roof. Within the street scene there are limited examples of flat roofed dormer windows, although on Clays Lane, which is a short distance from

the site, there are a number of dwellings that do have flat roofed dormer windows.

6. The proposed flat roof extension would replace almost the entirety of one side of the pitched roof, without any set up from the eaves. The scale, and design, of the extension would appear out of context with the host dwelling and would fundamentally change the appearance of the building; it would dominate this roof slope. Whilst the building may have a staggered appearance, it maintains a balance with the rear roof pitch visible either side of the dwelling. The proposed extension would unbalance the appearance of the building and would appear as an incongruous addition to the host dwelling. Consequently, the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling.
7. The host dwelling is located on a junction on a busy street, opposite a school and is within a prominent location within the street scene. The side of the pitched roof, where the extension is proposed, is visible for a significant distance along the road. Because the extension would occupy a large percentage of the roof slope and that it would be highly visible, it would also be prominent within the street scene. As the roof extension would appear as an incongruous addition to the host dwelling, it follows that it would result in harm to the character and appearance of the street scene.
8. The proposed reception extension would be located between the garage and the host dwelling and would be a similar height as the garage. The proposal would connect the two buildings and, because it would be subservient in scale and appearance, it would not result in harm to the character or appearance of the host dwelling. Given the size and location of the reception extension, between the two buildings, this would not harm the character and appearance of the street scene.
9. Therefore, the proposed roof extension would appear as an incongruous addition to the host dwelling which would lead to harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene. The proposal would not be compliant with Policy DP3 of the East Staffordshire Borough Council Local Plan 2012 – 2031 (LP) (2015) in so far as it relates to the need for development to be built in accordance with the East Staffordshire Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document which requires extensions to be subservient to the host dwelling in terms of its scale and form. The proposal would also be contrary to Policies SP24 and DP1 of the LP which requires development to contribute positively to an area and to be of an appropriate shape, volume and arrangement in relation to the street scene. The proposal would also be contrary to Policy B2 of the Branston Neighbourhood Development Plan 2012 – 2031 (2015) in so far as it seeks to ensure development will be of a high design quality and the proposal would be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework that notes that permission should be refused for development of poor design.

Other Matters

10. The appellant contends that the extension is necessary to create an additional bathroom on the first floor of the building which is needed for a future occupier who would require disabled access. However, no information has been presented with regards to the exact needs of the future occupier. As such, it is not clear why an upstairs bathroom is necessary. I am not convinced that the necessary headroom would be unable to be achieved through an alternative

proposal. I note that the appellant refers to alternative pitched designs that would not be suitable, but these have not been presented to me for consideration, so it is unclear whether this scheme is the only viable extension. Whilst I note the suggested needs of the future occupant, personal circumstances will seldom outweigh more general planning concerns in relation to the construction of a permanent building. Having regard to that, and the fact that little information is before me, I give limited weight to the personal circumstances presented.

11. Reference is made to the renovation of the property and the internal and external alterations to modernise the property. Whilst the other identified works could improve the appearance of the building, the proposal before me is for the reception extension and the roof extension alone. I have found that the roof extension would cause harm to the appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene. This harm would not be outweighed by other improvements to the appearance of the host dwelling.

Conclusion and Recommendation

12. Whilst the reception extension would not harm the character or appearance of the host dwelling, the proposed roof extension would appear as an incongruous addition to the host dwelling which is located within a prominent location within the street scene. Therefore, the proposal would result in harm to both the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene. The lack of harm that would arise from the reception extension and the personal circumstances of the appellant would not outweigh this. For the reasons given above, and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

G Sibley

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

13. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report, and, on that basis, I too agree that the appeal should be dismissed.

K Taylor

INSPECTOR