



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 January 2022

by Helen Smith BSc (Hons) MSc MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: Wednesday 16 February 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/C3430/D/21/3286034

65 Sytch Lane, Wombourne, WV5 0LB

- 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 Mrs Helena Elcocks against the decision of South Staffordshire Council.
 - The application Ref 21/00883/FUL, dated 17 August 2021, was refused by notice dated 24 September 2021.
 - The development proposed is a first floor side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a first floor side extension at 65 Sytch Lane, Wombourne, WV5 0LB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/00883/FUL, dated 17 August 2021, 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 materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans:
 - a. Location and Block Plan – 21 60 03C (dated: August 2021)
 - b. Survey 2021 – 21 60 07 (dated: August 2021)
 - c. Proposals A Reduced – 21 60 08A (dated: August 2021)

Preliminary Matters

2. The appellant registered a resubmission application (21/00654/FUL) with the Council. This application was for the full scheme, including the proposed first floor side extension on eastern side of No 65. However, the Council declined to determine this application. Therefore, a separate application (21/00883/FUL) was submitted to the Council for the additional first floor extension to the eastern side of the property. This separate application is the subject of this appeal.
3. During the application process, the following plan was superseded and therefore has not been included in the approved plans listed in the conditions above: Superseded Plan - Proposals A – 21 60 02A (dated: August 2021).

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site is a detached dwelling located on Sytch Lane. The property is set back from the road on a wide plot with a large rear garden. Sytch Lane is characterised by substantially sized detached dwellings of varying styles, which are generally set back from the road on spacious plots.
6. Permission is sought for a first floor side extension on the eastern side of 65 Sytch Lane, adjacent to No 67. Permission has already been granted for a first floor side extension on the western side, a double storey front extension and a single storey rear extension (21/00327/FUL). Construction work for this scheme has commenced on site.
7. The proposed extension would be 2.7m in width, which is less than the width of the original host dwelling. It is also less than the width of the western side extension that already has planning permission. In addition, the proposed extension would be set back from the front elevation of the original host dwelling and would also have a lower ridge height. This reduced width, combined with the set back and drop in ridge height would make the proposal appear subservient to the host dwelling. This is because the roofline would not protrude above the roofline of the existing dwelling and the set back would serve to overcome bonding and brick matching problems. There is also sufficient space on site to accommodate the proposed extension's volume.
8. In addition, the proposed eastern extension would have a ridge height to match the approved western first floor extension. In my judgement, this combined with the set back and positioning on the eastern side, would improve the visual balance of No 65, enhancing the central positioning of the two, front gable features and creating visual balance and rhythm when viewed from the street. As the appellant points out in their grounds of appeal, there is currently a mismatch in scale between the ground floor and first floor structures; the proposal would address this uneven design by rebalancing the form and shape of the property at first floor level, which would improve the appearance of the front elevation. Taken together with the external materials to match the host dwelling, the proposal would relate well to the host dwelling and would not be detrimental to its character and appearance.
9. I note the Parish Council's concern regarding overdevelopment of the host dwelling. However, I do not find the proposal to be an overdevelopment of the host dwelling or out of character with the surrounding area. Due to the site's spacious plot size, the proposal would not appear as a dominant mass on site as it does not infringe the established building line along Sytch Lane. It would also respect the gap between No 65 and the neighbouring property. Consequently, the proposal is not a dominant, overbearing feature that is out of keeping with the host dwelling or the street-scene. Rather, its design reflects the character and appearance of the host dwelling and would integrate positively to the surrounding area's identity in terms of scale, volume, mass, and materials.

10. For the reasons above, I conclude that the proposal would be in keeping with the character and appearance of the area and be compatible in design with the host dwelling. Accordingly, it complies with Policy EQ11 of the South Staffordshire Council's Core Strategy Development Plan Document (adopted 2012), which seeks to ensure proposals should contribute positively to the street scene. The proposal also accords with the South Staffordshire Design Guide (adopted 2018), which states that generally, extensions should be subservient to the main building, respect the scale and form of the main building and its relationship to adjacent buildings.
11. In addition, the proposal would adhere with the National Planning Policy Framework (para 130), which emphasises the importance of securing good design and states that development should respond to local character and add to the overall qualities of the area.

Conditions

12. I have assessed the conditions put forward by the Council against the Framework (para 56), and I am satisfied that these conditions meet the tests.
13. A standard time limit condition has been applied to ensure the development is built within 3 years of the date of this appeal decision.
14. To ensure the satisfactory appearance of the development, a condition is attached to require that the external materials match those of the existing building.
15. For reasons of certainty, a condition is imposed to ensure the development is undertaken in accordance with the approved plans.

Conclusion

16. For the reasons given, having considered the development plan as a whole, the approach in the NPPF, and taken account of all other material considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Helen Smith

INSPECTOR