



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit carried out on 16 April 2025

by **Jennifer Vyse DipTP MRTPI DipPBM**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 May 2025

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/C3430/D/25/3361588**

**Tudor House, Stafford Road, Penkridge, Stafford ST19 5AX**

- 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 Dave Webb against the decision of South Staffordshire Council.
  - The application No is 24/00920/FULHH.
  - The development proposed comprises a detached, oak-frame garage and car port.
- 

### Decision

1. For the reasons that follow, the appeal is dismissed.

### Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case relates to the effect of the development proposed on the character and appearance of the area.

### Reasons for the Decision

3. The appeal property comprises a two-storey detached dwelling at the entrance to a residential service road off Stafford Road. The house is set well back from the service road behind an extensive area of hardstanding. Well vegetated borders flank the side boundaries at the front of the property, with a high brick wall / railings running along the frontage boundary with the service road.
4. The proposed oak-framed structure, which would be sited to the front of the house, comprises a detached garage with a car port alongside (5.5m wide, 5.6m deep, with a pitched roof over to a height of almost 4m). It would be set some 2.35m back from the front boundary of the site, backing onto the boundary with the adjacent property to the northeast, Melystan.
5. The area has a pleasant leafy character, with housing set back from the service road frontage behind open front gardens. So far as I could see, there were no substantial detached buildings within the front gardens to any of the properties along the service road, with none drawn to my attention.
6. Existing vegetation within the front gardens to Melystan and the appeal property screen views of the appeal site on approach along the service road from the north. However, notwithstanding the band of mature vegetation that separates the service road from the main road, the proposed building would be clearly visible from Stafford Road on approach from the south when nearing the service road, and on entering the service road from this direction. It would also be seen in clear view from the adjacent bus stop and footways as well as from Dovedale Road opposite.

7. I fully appreciate that simply seeing a development does not necessarily equate to harm. I also recognise that some of the dwellings along the service road have projecting garages at the front. However, they are integral to the main dwelling and all (even those at Brooklands and Foxholes to the south of the site) are set further back into their respective sites than the building proposed.
8. In my view, the proposed building, which would be set well forward of the general line of development along the road (including the projecting garages adjacent), would be seen as unduly prominent on approach from the south and in views from opposite, dominating the front of the site, notwithstanding the vegetated backdrop along the boundary with Melystan. It would intrude into its leafy setting with a materially adverse impact on the established character and appearance of the street scene. That impact would be compounded if similar extensions were constructed to the front of neighbouring properties, which have front gardens of a similar length and area to the appeal property, applications for which would be difficult to resist if this appeal were allowed. I accept that there may be no current intentions to do so, but this might not always be the case.
9. The harm that I have found brings the development into conflict with Core Policy 4 and policies EQ4 and EQ11 of the South Staffordshire Core Strategy (2012), which together and among other things seek to achieve good design by protecting and enhancing the character and appearance of the area. There would be conflict too with the Staffordshire Design Guide (2018) which advises that garages should be positioned and designed so that they do not stand out abruptly from their surroundings. It would also be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework, which seeks to ensure that new development adds to the overall quality of an area and is sympathetic to local character.
10. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal should not succeed.

*Jennifer A Vyse*  
INSPECTOR