



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 July 2020

by Chris Forrett BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 08 September 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/X3405/W/20/3247038

23 & 25 New Penkridge Road, Cannock, Staffordshire WS11 1HW

- 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 Bryan Kent against the decision of Cannock Chase District Council.
 - The application Ref CH/19/342, dated 18 September 2019, was refused by notice dated 20 December 2019.
 - The development proposed is roof alterations and loft extensions jointly to Nos. 23 and 25.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for roof alterations and loft extensions jointly to Nos. 23 and 25 at 23 & 25 New Penkridge Road, Cannock, Staffordshire WS11 1HW in accordance with the terms of the application, CH/19/342, dated 18 September 2019, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 852 02A (proposals A); 852 03; and 852 04.
 - 3) The external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be of the same type, colour and texture as those used on the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is located on the south side of New Penkridge Road which is within the built-up area of Cannock. The street has a wide variety of architectural style of properties including both traditional and modern designs.
4. The appeal properties themselves are a pair of Victorian semi-detached dwellings with gable features to both the front and side elevations. From my site visit I saw that 27 New Penkridge Road is set back a much greater distance from the road than the appeal properties and therefore the side elevation of No.25 is prominent in the streetscene.

5. The appeal proposal is to create accommodation at second floor level which would include a change in the roof profile to the rear section of the dwellings. This would involve a much steeper roof pitch to the outer side elevations of the properties and a flat roof section broadly in line with the main ridge height. This would also extend out over the outriggers to the rear.
6. With the exception of the west side elevation of No.25 the development would have very limited visibility from the street. That said, when viewed from the west, the side elevation of No. 25 would be readily seen. However, the main visual change to this aspect would be a steeper roof pitch beyond the existing gable feature. To my mind, this would not have an adverse impact on the streetscene, particularly given that the roof slope would be tiled in a similar fashion to what currently exists. Whilst I acknowledge that the roof alterations would be visible from the rear of other residential properties, I consider that this would not result in an unacceptable impact.
7. Turning to the effect of the development on the host properties themselves, the alteration to the roof shape at the rear would not be characteristic to that of the original dwellings and as a result some visual harm would result. That said, it is also clear that the level of harm would not be significant. Nevertheless, some harm would result.
8. However, the Appellant has drawn my attention to a potential fallback scheme which could be implemented without the need for any planning permission. Such a scheme could deliver a similar standard of internal accommodation and as such I consider that there is at least some prospect of this being implemented should the appeal fail.
9. Significantly, this fallback scheme would introduce a box dormer window onto the exposed element of the side elevation of No.25 which would have a detrimental impact on the streetscene as well as the host property. Taking this into account, the appeal scheme presents a much more visually pleasing development and this weighs in favour of the current proposal.
10. Taking all of the above into account, I consider that the level of harm to the character of the host dwelling from the appeal proposal is more than outweighed by benefits associated with the overall design when compared to the fallback position.
11. In coming to the above view, I have taken into account Policy CP3 of the Cannock Chase Local Plan (2014) (LP) and the Cannock Chase Design Supplementary Planning Document (2016) (DSPD) and in particular the requirements for development to be well-related to their surroundings which I take to also include the character and appearance of the host building. In my view, the appeal proposal has clearly taken this into account in the formulation of the revised appeal proposal which is vastly superior to the fallback position development.
12. For the above reasons the proposal would not result in any significant harm to the character and appearance of the area and would accord with Policy CP3 of the LP and the supporting DSPD which amongst other matters seek to ensure that key requirements of high quality design are addressed in development proposals including matters which ensure that new development complements the character and appearance of the local area. It would also accord with the overarching design aims of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Conditions

13. The Council has provided a list of suggested conditions in their appeal questionnaire that it considers would be appropriate. Other than the standard time limit condition, it is necessary to ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans for the reason of certainty. In the interests of the character and appearance of the area, a condition relating to matching materials is also necessary.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Chris Forrett

INSPECTOR