



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 October 2024

by L C Hughes BA (Hons) MTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 01 November 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/C3430/W/24/3346830

130 Common Road, Wombourne, Staffordshire WV5 0NB

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Arundee Pawar against the decision of South Staffordshire District Council.
 - The application Ref is 23/01081/FUL.
 - The development proposed is single storey side extension to shop unit.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for single storey side extension to shop unit at 130 Common Road, Wombourne, Staffordshire WV5 0NB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 23/01081/FUL, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing no:23028 300 Proposed – Alternative scheme plans and elevations.
 - 3) The external materials of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building unless approved in writing by the local planning authority.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal property, 130 Common Road (No 130) is a convenience store situated in a primarily residential area on the corner of Common Road and Park Avenue, at the end of a small parade of retail and commercial units and associated parking on Common Road. Park Avenue is largely comprised of residential dwellings. The property at 128 Common Road (No 128) which, like the appeal building, has a side elevation along Park Avenue, is in use as a takeaway.
4. Whilst the proposed extension would not disrupt the building line along Common Road, it would extend out towards Park Avenue. However, the appeal property already extends out towards the pavement, by virtue of a raised planter and an area behind a brick wall and metal fencing, which at the time of

my site visit housed an extractor fan, refuse bins and an entrance to the first floor office. As such, No 130 already sits forward of the residential dwellings along Park Avenue.

5. No 128 has a small extension which extends to the footway along Park Avenue. This is not of a high standard of design and I do not know of the planning circumstances surrounding its construction. However, notwithstanding this feature, the property itself lies some distance forward of the building line of the residential dwellings along the street. When viewed from Park Avenue, the two corner buildings already appear set forward and distinct and separate from the residential properties.
6. The frontages of the residential dwellings along Park Avenue face the street behind gardens and driveways. The appeal property has a different appearance, with its side elevation facing the street. This orientation, along with the building having far less of a set back from the road than the residential properties, further differentiates it from the neighbouring dwellings.
7. Whilst the proposed extension would be bulkier than the existing planter and storage area, it would not extend closer to the pavement and it would not disrupt the prevailing pattern of development. It would be single storey and subservient to the host property. As such, despite the narrow road, it would not appear as prominent, jarring or incongruous in the street scene.
8. The front of the proposed extension would be at a slight angle, which would reduce its impact when viewed from Common Road. There are other angled building features in the small parade of retail and commercial units, and I noted on my site visit that the steps leading up to the appeal building, a walled planter and street planting to the front of the property are all angled towards Common Road. The angled element of the proposed extension would therefore not be an uncharacteristic feature within the street scene.
9. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore accord with Policies EQ4 and EQ11 of the South Staffordshire Core Strategy 2012 which seek to ensure that development does not have a detrimental effect on the immediate environment and contributes positively to the street scene. It would also comply with guidance contained within the South Staffordshire Design Guide 2018 which seeks high quality design that harmonises with surrounding buildings. Furthermore, it would accord with the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks to achieve well designed places, and the National Design Guide and National Model Design Code which seek to ensure that new development is well designed and benefits people and communities.

Conditions

10. I have considered the conditions suggested by the Council, having regard to the Planning Practice Guidance on conditions, and have amended them slightly in the interest of clarity. In addition to the standard timeframe condition, it is necessary to impose a condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the submitted plans in the interest of certainty. A condition requiring that the external materials match those of the existing building unless otherwise agreed with the local planning authority is necessary, in order to protect the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposal would comply with the development plan and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it.
12. As a result, the appeal should be allowed.

L C Hughes

INSPECTOR