



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 August 2020

by William Cooper BA (Hons) MA CMLI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20th August 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/X3405/D/20/3254074

10 Stafford Street, Heath Hayes, Cannock WS12 2EH

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Daniel Bryant against the decision of the Cannock Chase District Council.
 - The application Ref: CH/20/131 dated 26 March 2020, was refused by notice dated 1 June 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as an extension on top of a garage conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for an extension on top of a garage conversion in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref: CH/20/131, dated 26 March 2020, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved drawings: Site Plan - Ref 08616271; First Floor (Actual); Second Floor; First Floor (Proposed); Existing Front Elevation and Proposed Front Elevation; Ground Floor 1/2; Ground Floor 2/2; Side Elevation (West) and Side Elevation (Proposed); Side Elevation 2 (Proposed) (East).
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the elevations of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on:
 - the character and appearance of the area, including the host dwelling, and
 - parking stress and highway safety.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. In the area comprising Stafford Street and roads leading off it, the flat roof of the proposal would differ from the more prevalent pitched roof profiles of residential extensions. Nevertheless, the area is characterised by a variety of older and modern building profiles and lines, ranging from one to three storeys. A variety of construction materials is also evident in the neighbourhood including red brick, render, UPVC, timber, composite material, slate and tile.
4. Within this relatively diverse townscape, the proposed dark grey UPVC cladding would match that on the host building, and approximate the colour of roofing on the host dwelling and other properties in the vicinity. Moreover, viewed 'on the ground' from Mary Elizabeth Court, the proposal would blend in with the host building's extended profile, which steps up with a variety of angular and oblique lines. Sight lines to the proposal would also be contained by the neighbourhood's tight 'jigsaw' like suburban grain. The proposal's set back from the front facade of the host building and its location approximately 10m back from the highway would also help to moderate its impact. Viewed from the front on Stafford Street, the lower ridge height compared to the host building, would further help the proposal to fit in to its setting.
5. The Council is concerned that the proposed extension would appear an incongruous addition to the host dwelling and the area. However, the combination of assimilating factors described above would enable the proposal to fit acceptably into its setting and neighbourhood. Therefore, the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the area. As such, it would not conflict with Policy CP3 of the Cannock Chase Local Plan (Part 1) (2014), which seeks to ensure that development complements local character.
6. Given my finding above, the scenario of concern in the Cannock Chase Design Supplementary Planning Document - that a flat roof extension to a pitched roof house would look incongruous - would not occur. As such, the overarching principle of good design would not be offended.

Parking and highway safety

7. The dwelling has off-street parking space for two cars. The Council is concerned that the proposed addition of a fourth bedroom would fail to achieve the standard of three spaces in the Cannock Chase Parking Standards, Travel Plans and Developer Contributions for Sustainable Transport Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). Nevertheless, paragraph 4.1 of the SPD allows for the possibility of less provision, to meet local circumstances. Location within local centres and realistic access to frequent public transport are cited as an example, indicating the type of accessibility considerations that may come into play.
8. During my site visit, albeit a snapshot in time, I observed that spare on-street parking capacity appears limited in the neighbourhood, within the context of dwellings and customers stopping off to use nearby shops and facilities on the B4154 Hednesford Road. That said, the appeal property is within a short walking distance of the selection of facilities including shops, takeaways, post office and a pub. It is also accessible to nearby bus stops on Hednesford Road, which provide regular access to Cannock and Lichfield. As such, there are realistic alternatives to the private motor car, for future occupiers of the proposed extension to access various services and facilities in Heath Hayes and beyond.

9. The appellant indicates that they are negotiating to buy land for more parking. Even if this did not happen, taking the above together, I conclude that the proposed addition of a bedroom would not result in a significant increase in parking stress, or an unacceptable associated highway safety risk. As such, the proposal would not conflict with Paragraph 109 of the National Planning Policy Framework. Given the local circumstances that I have identified above, the proposal would also not conflict with paragraph 4.1 of the SPD.

Conditions

10. In addition to the standard commencement condition, a condition that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans is necessary to provide certainty. A condition covering materials is necessary in the interests of safeguarding the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

William Cooper

INSPECTOR