



---

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 June 2023

**by Rachel Hall BSc MSc MRTPI**

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

**Decision date: 11<sup>th</sup> August 2023**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/B3410/W/22/3295379**

**8 Arden Road, Barton Under Needwood DE13 8LD**

- 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 and Mrs Holden against the decision of East Staffordshire Borough Council.
  - The application Ref P202101652, dated 14 December 2021, was refused by notice dated 16 February 2022.
  - The development proposed is new single storey dwelling at the rear of No.8.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## Main Issue

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

## Reasons

3. In the vicinity of the appeal site, houses front on to the road. They are positioned to a consistent building line and separated from the road by modest front gardens and drives. Houses on Arden Road appear to have reasonably generous rear gardens providing a welcome sense of space behind the houses in what is otherwise a relatively high density residential area.
4. The proposed dwelling would be positioned behind No 8 without its own frontage on Arden Road and therefore at odds with the pattern of development here. The proposal would be low rise and its visibility from the surrounding area would be relatively limited. However, from immediately outside No 8 and on entering the site, its position would appear at odds with the prevailing pattern of development. Furthermore, although it would meet the Council's standard for outdoor garden space, the site access between Nos 8 and 10 would appear narrow and the proposed house would be positioned tight up to the rear and one side boundary. Consequently, the addition of an independent dwelling together with a parking area and associated residential paraphernalia would appear cramped and incongruous here.
5. My attention has been drawn to the presence of other infill developments in the locality. Details of specific schemes on Mill Lane, Efflinch Lane, Station Road, Main Street, Short Lane and Westmead Road have not been provided to enable detailed comparison of those schemes and the circumstances under which they were permitted. However I note that houses on Mill Lane are located on only

one side of the road. Therefore a sense of openness is retained in the surroundings, notwithstanding development in a rear garden.

6. Similarly, I observed that the scheme to the rear of 69 Efflinch Lane has a comparatively wide access from the Lane and appears to back on to open land, and therefore does not appear cramped. In addition, the layout and building line on Short Lane appears more varied than in the vicinity of the appeal site. Moreover, Main Street comprises a mix of commercial and residential uses and therefore is not comparable to the appeal site. Consequently, from the evidence before me the presence of other developments in rear gardens in the wider area does not alter my reasoning here.
7. I therefore conclude that the proposal would not achieve good design and would harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area. Consequently, the proposal would conflict with Policy DP1 of the East Staffordshire Local Plan (October 2015) (Local Plan) which generally supports proposals that achieve high quality design, including with respect to the prevailing pattern of development. It would similarly conflict with Policy DP3 of the Local Plan which supports proposals for residential development where certain criteria are met, including avoiding over intensification of an area. Also, it would conflict with Policy SP24 of the Local Plan which requires high quality design, including in respect of layout and patterns of development.
8. Similarly, the proposal would not be in accordance with the East Staffordshire Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (February 2008) which overall seeks to ensure developments achieve high quality design. In addition, the proposal would conflict with paragraph 124 of the Framework which, whilst encouraging proposals that would make efficient use of land, also requires that decisions take into account the desirability of maintaining an area's prevailing character and setting (including residential gardens).

### **Other Matters**

9. The proposal would achieve an incremental increase in housing supply within an existing settlement in support of the Government objective of boosting the supply of homes. Small sites can make an important contribution to housing supply and can be built-out relatively quickly. There would be small economic advantages of construction of the proposal which would be short term and a further modest benefit from occupation of a single dwelling and associated spending in the locality. That the proposal would provide acceptable levels of private outdoor space and privacy for the existing occupants of No 8 and future occupants of the proposal, and could achieve and acceptable access with respect to highway safety, are neutral considerations.

### **Conclusion**

10. Nevertheless, the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area in conflict with the development plan taken as a whole. There are no material considerations that indicate the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, for the reasons given, I conclude that the appeal should not succeed.

*Rachel Hall*

INSPECTOR