



## Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 5 January 2021

**by Jonathan Edwards BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

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

**Decision date: 19 January 2021**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/X3405/W/20/3260212**  
**21 Stafford Road, Cannock, WS11 4AF**

- 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 D Andrews against the decision of Cannock Chase District Council.
  - The application Ref CH/20/026, dated 14 January 2020, was refused by notice dated 19 June 2020.
  - The development proposed is site redevelopment to provide 18 room house of multiple occupancy.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Main Issues

2. The main issues are (i) the effect on the character and appearance of the area, and (ii) the effect of associated parking on highway safety and social cohesion.

### Reasons

#### *Character and appearance*

3. The proposal would have a slightly smaller footprint than the existing building on the site and it would be a similar height or lower than nearby properties. However, its Park Road elevation would have a 2 storey high double gable whereas the side extension to the rear of the existing building is single storey. Due to this increase in height, the proposal would be markedly more prominent and visually imposing than the existing building when seen from Park Road. Also, it would be adjacent to the pavement while other buildings in Park Road tend to be set off the footway. As such, the building would stand out as an overly prominent development in the street scene.
4. The proposal's flank elevation would include more architectural features than the existing building which is bland. Moreover, the development would be lower and less overpowering than a previous scheme that was refused planning permission. However, these factors would fail to address or override the excessive dominance and incongruity of the proposal.
5. For these reasons, I conclude the development would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. In this respect, it would be contrary

to policy CP3 of the Cannock Chase Local Plan 2014, which aims, amongst other things, to ensure development is well related to its surroundings.

### *Parking*

6. Residents and visitors travelling by motorised vehicle to the proposal would be reliant on off-site parking facilities and roadside parking is heavily restricted close to the site. However, the development would be opposite a bus station and within reasonable walking distance of a broad range of facilities and so residents and visitors would not be heavily reliant on car usage. Also, there is no evidence that shows the scheme would increase demand for roadside parking compared to that which could be generated by the existing building.
7. Even if the proposal did result in an increase in parking demand, the Council's submissions do not explain how this would prejudice highway safety. Also, no evidence has been provided that shows general demand for public or roadside parking is particularly high and so I am unconvinced the proposal would lead to conflict between residents of other properties and occupiers of the development. Furthermore, the Council has not explained how the lack of parking as part of the scheme would lead to crime or a fear of crime. For these reasons, I conclude that parking associated with the proposal would not lead to any harmful effects in respect of highway safety or social cohesion.

### **Other Matters**

8. The proposal would be close to the Cannock Town Centre Conservation Area and St Luke's church, a grade II listed building. Despite the identified detriment to the street scene, the proposal would be a sufficient distance away so as to not harm the setting or significance of these heritage assets.
9. The development would make effective use of a small brownfield site in an urban location. In these regards, it gains support from the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). However, the scheme would harm the character of the area and so would fail to improve its quality. As such, the Framework states permission should be refused. This is the overriding issue and the benefits of the scheme do not outweigh the identified harm that would be caused in this respect.
10. A unilateral undertaking has been provided that would secure a financial contribution to mitigate the adverse impact of recreational activities on Cannock Chase Special Area of Conservation (the SAC). The development is unacceptable for other reasons and so it is unnecessary for me to consider further its effect on the integrity of the SAC or the undertaking. For clarity purposes, if I had found the appeal to be acceptable in this regard, such a finding would not have affected my main conclusion.

### **Conclusion**

11. For the above reasons, I dismiss the appeal.

*Jonathan Edwards*

INSPECTOR