
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 June 2021

by D Hartley BA (Hons) MTP MBA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 June 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/K3415/W/21/3271941
22B Grange Lane, Lichfield WS13 7EE

- 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 Lee McArdle against the decision of Lichfield District Council.
 - The application Ref 20/01613/FUL, dated 12 November 2020, was refused by notice dated 11 March 2021.
 - The development proposed is alterations and extensions to existing dwelling and construction of new dwelling within curtilage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal proposal relates to alterations and extensions to an existing detached dwelling including a single storey side and a two storey rear extension and the erection of a new 3 bedroom two storey detached dwelling to the side. The existing dwelling would have private amenity space of about 65 square metres and the new dwelling would have private amenity space of about 109 square metres.
4. This proposal follows the consideration of a similar appeal in August 2020¹, albeit that such a proposed dwelling was larger and with a flank wall extending approximately 12 metres in length, whereas the erected appeal dwelling would have a flank wall extending about 6.1 metres in length. I have taken the above appeal decision into account, as a material planning consideration, as part of the determination of this appeal. I do not disagree that in respect of outside amenity space, the appeal proposal is acceptable and in that regard the proposal has overcome concern raised by the previous Inspector. Furthermore, I am satisfied that in terms of the effect of the development on the occupiers of neighbouring properties in respect of outlook, light and privacy, the alterations and extensions to the existing dwelling would be acceptable in planning terms.
5. In respect of the character and appearance main issue, the point of dispute between the main parties relates to the construction of the new dwelling on the

¹ Appeal Ref APP/K345/W/20/3253183

site. In dealing with a larger new dwelling on the site, the previous Inspector commented that *'due to the massing and length of the built form within its plot shape, the proposal would fail to harmonise with the pattern of housing and appear as an incongruous addition to the street-scene'*.

6. This part of Grange Lane includes detached and semi-detached two storey dwellings which are predominantly built in brick (some with cladding) and with tiled roofs and which are positioned within relatively spacious plots. The dwellings are not identical in architectural terms, but there is a notable rhythm and regularity of relatively wide gaps between most of the properties which adds positively to the appearance of this part of the street-scene. I appreciate that the space between properties is in some areas enclosed at ground floor level due to the existence of side garages and other development. However, and even where such an arrangement exists, there are still relatively wide gaps between dwellings at first floor level.
7. In the context of the above, the proposed dwelling would be separated from the existing dwelling on the site by only about 1 metre and with the overhanging eaves of the roofs of the properties almost touching. This would be materially at odds with the spacing that exists between most of the other properties in this part of Grange Lane and, furthermore, this harm would be compounded as a result of very close position of the two storey side elevation with the boundary to the access to No 24 Grange Lane. Overall, and taking into account the prevailing pattern of development in the locality, the new dwelling would appear cramped and tight within its plot and hence would appear incongruous when viewed by passers-by. I note that the proposed dwelling would not extend as far into the plot when compared to the previous appeal proposal, but this would not alleviate my concern in respect of the spacing between dwellings and the resultant cramped form of two storey development on the appeal site.
8. In reaching the above view, I have considered the Council's concern about the provision of a new gable fronted dwelling. I acknowledge that gable fronted dwellings are not typical in the area. However, this in itself would not justify withholding planning permission, given that the existing dwelling and No 22A are designed in this way. However, the acceptability of the proposal in this regard does not overcome my other concern detailed above.
9. For the above reasons, I therefore conclude that when the development is considered as a whole, significant harm would be caused to the character and appearance of the area. Consequently, it would not accord with the design, character and appearance requirements of policies BE1 and CP3 of the Lichfield District Local Plan Strategy 2015, the Council's Sustainable Design Supplementary Planning Document and Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Other Matters

10. I acknowledge that in terms of the location of the site, the development plan would permit residential development in principle. However, this does not obviate the need to achieve good design. The proposal would deliver a net additional one dwelling which would make a positive contribution to housing land supply. However, the contribution towards housing land supply from only one dwelling would be limited, as would the economic benefits arising out of construction and use of the proposed development.

11. The evidence indicates that the appeal site is within a 15km radius of Cannock Chase SAC. As the appeal is being dismissed, it has not been necessary for me to consider this matter any further.
12. None of the other matters raised alter or outweigh my conclusion on the main issue.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the development does not accord with the development plan for the area taken as a whole and there are no material considerations that indicate the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, the appeal should be dismissed.

D Hartley

INSPECTOR