



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 August 2023

by K Ford MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3rd October 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/B3410/D/23/3325433

175 Burton Road, Branston, Burton upon Trent, Staffordshire DE14 3DR

- 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 Maroof Hussain against the decision of East Staffordshire Borough Council.
 - The application Ref P/2022/01283, dated 8 October 2022, was refused by notice dated 30 June 2023.
 - The development proposed is one and 2 storey rear extension and single storey front extension and carport and front porch/ canopy.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The Council has identified no issue with the scale, design or materials of the rear extensions. I have no reason to disagree. The main issue therefore is the effect of the front extension and porch on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a 2 storey semi detached property set back from the road by a front garden and driveway. The dwelling is located on a main road of commercial uses and similarly styled residential properties, some of which have been extended and altered. The appeal property has been extended following the grant of planning permission in 2021. However, the development has not been built in line with the plans and so retrospective planning permission is sought.
4. The height, size and overall scale of the front extension and porch creates a highly visible, disproportionate addition which obscures the bottom of the first floor windows and dominates the front elevation, creating an incongruous development within the street scene. This is particularly when viewed in the context of neighbouring dwellings. Based on my assessment of the plans and my observations onsite, I disagree with the appellant's suggestion that the difference in the appearance of the permitted and developed schemes is minimal.
5. The set back of the dwelling from the road does not mitigate the harm and the caravan sales centre and neighbouring hedgerow only provide some screening

in certain views. The development is clearly visible within the street scene from numerous angles.

6. The appellant has referenced other dwellings that have been subject to extensions in support of their case. However, I do not consider any of them to be directly comparable to the scheme before me in terms of scale or appearance or impact on the street scene. The appellant also refers to planning permissions that have been granted elsewhere in the road. I have limited information about these permissions but in any event each case is determined on its own merits and that is what I have done.
7. The development of the front extension and porch harms the character and appearance of the area. It therefore conflicts with Policies SP1, SP24, DP1 and DP3 of the East Staffordshire Local Plan. Amongst other things, these policies require new development to be of high quality appropriate design and positively contribute to the area. It also conflicts with the part of Policy B2 of the Branston Neighbourhood Plan which requires new development to be of high quality design and reflect and respect local characteristics.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons identified and taking into account all other matters, including representations by interested parties, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

K Ford

INSPECTOR