



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 December 2020

**by David M H Rose BA(Hons) MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 07 December 2020**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/X3405/W/20/3255714**

**333 Longford Road, Cannock WS11 1NG**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
  - The appeal is made by Mr C Penhorwood against the decision of Cannock Chase District Council.
  - The application reference CH/20/126, dated 31 March 2020, was refused by notice dated 27 May 2020.
  - The development proposed is a two bed detached bungalow (access and layout not reserved).
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether or not the proposal would be well-related to its surroundings having particular regard to: (a) the character of the area; and (b) the living conditions of future occupants of the proposed bungalow and neighbouring residents.

### Reasons

3. The immediate surroundings are characterised by bungalows and houses, of varied design and proportions, in linear form, with front gardens of broadly comparable depth. Although it is said that the existing plot, in terms of width and shape, can be distinguished from its neighbours, the proposed bungalow would be located deep into the rear garden of no. 333 and served by a lengthy drive. In my opinion, irrespective of limited glimpsed views of the proposed bungalow from the street, the scheme would be at odds with the prevailing pattern of development along the road frontage.
4. In terms of living conditions, despite the tapering nature of the plot and the confinement arising from existing and likely boundary screening, the garden area associated with the proposed bungalow would exceed the Council's minimum guidelines. In my opinion, the proposed plot would be capable of providing future occupants of the bungalow with reasonable outlook especially as neighbouring long rear gardens offer an added sense of openness.
5. Although the proposed bungalow would be physically isolated from the Longford Road frontage, I am not convinced that its level of seclusion would be sufficient to run counter to the aim of creating inclusive and accessible development. Moreover, in terms of security, natural surveillance of the new

driveway would be available from front and side windows in the existing bungalow (no. 333) and also, on a reasonable assumption, from front facing windows in the proposed dwelling.

6. The proposed new driveway, between nos. 333 and 335, would run close to both properties and alongside their rear gardens. Although it is noted that no. 335 has a blank side elevation, no. 333 has a bedroom window facing the planned access. Notwithstanding the claimed limited traffic likely to be generated, I consider that the introduction of vehicles, unrelated to either frontage dwelling, would result in a level of noise and disturbance which would be intrusive to neighbouring residents.
7. Local and national policies support sustainable development with particular reference to windfall opportunities within urban areas, and increasing both housing delivery and the choice of homes. High quality design is also a key consideration.
8. In this case, the proposed bungalow would not be well-related to existing buildings and their surroundings, in terms of layout and access, and traffic movements would cause harm to the living conditions of neighbouring residents. Although I have acknowledged that the proposal would be capable of creating a reasonable living environment for future occupants, this is insufficient to outweigh the compelling harm that I have described. On this basis, I conclude that the proposal would be in conflict with identified key requirements of Policy CP3 of the Cannock Chase Local Plan which are relevant to the main issue.
9. My attention has been drawn to a bungalow (85a) at the rear of 87 Gorsey Lane and the related claim that it has not caused any harm to local character and appearance. I have not been provided with any further comparative analysis or the material considerations which led to a favourable outcome. However, from my visit, I formed the distinct impression that its backland location, served by a narrow drive, was the dichotomy of local context. I am not convinced that this example provides a basis to undermine my consideration of this appeal on its case specific facts.
10. In reaching my conclusion, I have had regard to the benefits which would be associated with the project. However, I find that these would be strongly outweighed by a form of development which would not be well-related to its surroundings and in conflict with the development plan.
11. I have noted that all development within the district that would lead to a net increase in dwellings will be required to mitigate adverse impact on the Cannock Chase Special Area of Conservation (SAC). Such mitigation measures would be secured by a financial contribution towards works on the SAC as required by the Council's Community Infrastructure Levy. In view of my conclusion above, I do not need to consider this matter further.
12. Having considered these and all other matters raised, I find nothing of sufficient weight to lead me to a different conclusion.

*David MH Rose*

Inspector