



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 April 2025 by E Nutman BA (Hons)

Decision by Mr A Spencer-Peet BSc(Hons) PGDip.LP Solicitor (Non Practising)

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 09 May 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/C3430/D/25/3360884

14 Dunlin Drive, Featherstone, South Staffordshire WV10 7TG

- 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 Violeta Florea against the decision of South Staffordshire District Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/00727/FULHH.
 - The development proposed is a front entrance porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matters

3. As noted in the application and appeal documentation, and as seen from visiting the site, the development has already been carried out. Notwithstanding that, it is not necessary to refer to the retrospective nature of the proposal in the description of the development.

Main Issue

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

Reasons for the Recommendation

Character and Appearance

5. The appeal site is situated at the end of a private driveway which is accessed off Dunlin Drive. The site is separated from the main street by a large and open green area, resulting in the property being widely visible within the street scene. The site is separated from this green area by low level hedging. The external facing material seen to the host property's walls is red brick. Many properties along Dunlin Drive can be seen with small-scale porches to their frontages.
6. Whilst I acknowledge that 14 Dunlin Drive is the last dwelling at the end of a private road, the proposed porch is bulky in scale due to its depth and pitched roof. This, combined with the openness surrounding the site, results in the porch being visible from some distance when passing through Dunlin Drive despite its location at the

end of the private road. The low-level hedging between the site and green area, is not considered established enough to screen the development as the porch is still highly visible above and through the gaps of the hedging.

7. Whilst porch structures can be seen to many of the properties along Dunlin Drive, these are modest in scale and of a form that complements their host dwellings. The depth of the development projects a considerable distance forward of the host property's front elevation and obstructs views of the property's bay window to the other side. The pitched roof's ridge height is in line with the very bottom of the windowsill at first floor level, resulting in the porch appearing as a discordant addition.
8. Porch structures seen within the surrounding area are inconspicuous and subordinate to the properties that they serve. The development does not reflect the character of these existing porches as it is excessive in bulk and the height of the pitched roof results in the porch appearing disproportionate in relation to the host dwelling. Consequently, it is not considered to be a harmonious addition to the host dwelling.
9. The scale is exacerbated by the incongruous use of render and dark coloured cladding. This is a stark contrast to the red brick seen to the walls of the host property and to the walls of neighbouring and nearby dwellings. This use of materials does not aid the development in assimilating with the existing character of the dwelling, nor with the character or appearance of surrounding dwellings. Taking this into account, I consider that the development is a discordant and dominant addition which adversely affects the appearance of the host dwelling and would be harmful to the established character and appearance of the surrounding area. The openness of the green to the front of the property also results in the development being seen from a considerable distance and at many different angles.
10. The degree of openness combined with the incongruous design of the porch results in the development having unacceptable impacts on the appearance of the host property and character of the surrounding area. As such the development is considered to conflict with Policy EQ11 of the adopted South Staffordshire Core Strategy (2012) which, amongst other matters, seeks high quality design that respects local character and distinctiveness.

Conclusion and Recommendation

11. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

E Nutman

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

12. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Mr A Spencer-Peet

INSPECTOR