



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 03 January 2024

by **D Cleary MTCP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27TH January 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Z3445/D/24/3353277

28 Greenheart, Amington, Tamworth, Staffordshire B77 4NG

- 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 Mal Diamond against the decision of Tamworth Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 0127/2024.
 - The development proposed as originally described is to erect a first storey side extension over existing part (enlarge existing bedroom and en-suite facility).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The Government published a revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) on 12 December 2024. Those parts of the Framework most relevant to this appeal have not been amended. As a result, I have not sought submissions on the revised Framework, and I am satisfied that no party's interests have been prejudiced by taking this approach.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the building and surrounding area.

Reasons

4. No.28 Greenheart is a two-storey detached property of brick and tile construction which occupies a corner plot location on a sharp bend along Greenheart. The design of the original dwelling includes a standard pitched roof with side gables. It appears as though the dwelling has been extended previously with two-storey side and rear extensions, and a further single storey extension to the side which is positioned close to the side boundary. As extended the dwelling has a mix of perpendicular rear and side facing gables and a small front facing gable. These extensions have resulted in a dwelling which has an unusual roof composition. Greenheart is predominantly residential in character comprising a mix of two-storey detached and semi-detached properties. The street pattern results in various dwellings located on corner plots along Greenheart. These corner plots generally have retained gaps to the side, to varying extent. While the gaps are not significant, they help to provide a degree of openness within the street.

5. The proposed extension would be positioned above the existing ground floor side extension. The extension would have front and rear facing gables with a roof which slopes away from the side boundary. This would add a further roof form to the dwelling which would jarringly contrast with the larger side facing gables contained within the original dwelling and two-storey side extension. The addition of a contrasting roof form next to the side gables would result in the dwelling appearing visually confused. This would be further exacerbated by the limited depth of the extension meaning it would appear out of proportion with the existing dwelling across two-storeys.
6. The increase in width across two-storeys would result in a dwelling which is more than double the original width. While the height of the extension would be lower than the existing dwelling and existing two-storey extension, the cumulative width, would result in an extension which would further elongate the dwelling over two-storeys. Therefore, the extension would fail to appear subservient to the original property.
7. While there is a general close-knit pattern of development in the surrounding area, corner plots have a greater degree of separation from their side boundaries which allows for an important sense of openness at corners within the estate. The extension would result in the width of the plot being developed, across two storeys, almost in its entirety. As such, the development would further erode the visual gap across the corner which is an important characteristic of the area. Therefore, the development would appear at odds with the general pattern of development along Greenheart.
8. For the above reasons, I conclude that the development would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the building and surrounding area. Therefore, the development conflicts with Policy EN5 of the Tamworth Borough Council Local Plan 2006-2031 (2016) of the Solihull Local Plan (2013) which, amongst other things, seeks to deliver high quality design in new development which respects local characteristics. The development also fails to adhere to the guidance contained within the Design: Supplementary Planning Document (2019) which requires that extensions be well designed and enhance the appearance of the property.

Other Matters

9. It is acknowledged that there are some economic, social and environmental benefits associated with the extension, including improvements to the existing housing stock. However, these benefits would be limited to those associated with extensions to a single dwelling, which would not outweigh the permanent harm that the development would have on the character and appearance of the dwelling and surrounding area.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

D Cleary

INSPECTOR