
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 June 2025 by E Clifford BA (Hons) MA

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Y3425/D/25/3364441

2 Hargreaves Lane, Stafford, Staffordshire ST17 9AE

- 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 Stephen Harvey against the decision of Stafford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/39786/HOU.
 - The development proposed is described as the refurbishment and extension to mid-century detached dwelling in large garden plot.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for development described as the refurbishment and extension to mid-century detached dwelling in large garden plot at 2 Hargreaves Lane, Stafford, Staffordshire ST17 9AE in accordance with the terms of the application, ref 24/39786/HOU, 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 nos: 2403_P_11 Rev A, 2403_P_12 Rev A, 2403_P_09 Rev A, 2403_P_08 Rev A, 2403_P_10 Rev A, 2403_P_13 Rev A, and 2403_P_07 Rev A.

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 scheme. The main issue in regard to which is its effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

3. The appeal building is a detached and relatively modern secluded bungalow in a leafy area, surrounded by other dwellings, some of which have been heavily extended. There is a quaint modesty to the building befitting of its age. It is finished in buff brick with a concrete tiled roof. A dormer is in the rear roof slope and there are some timber extensions/outbuildings to the side.
4. The use of timber is already a striking aspect of the property and the addition of the similar cladding to the proposed extension would strengthen the vertical emphasis that the existing timber provides. The change in its colour from brown to black would not be major. Given the density of the existing verdant boundary treatment and the variety in the street scene, the visual effect would be negligible.

5. The massing of the proposed development would significantly alter the overall bulk of the property. The front extension would house the relocated staircase and thus have a pitched roof, observing the character of the existing dwelling. Whilst much larger than the existing porch, it would remain subservient to the host dwelling and successfully read as an extension to the original. When viewed from the front of the property, the scale of the proposal would be indiscernible.
6. The large rear extension to the existing utility room would feature a combined mono-pitch and flat roof. The set back from the street would mean that this would be largely obscured. Whilst being composed of a number of different roof shapes and pitches, the rear element has been designed as a contemporary addition, as have the other alterations which utilise bold geometric shapes. This approach is therefore deliberate and would be read as part of the design of the alterations holistically. Taken as a whole, the changes would respect the scale and contextual modesty of the dwelling and would not dominate the generosity of the plot.
7. Due to the angle of the property and proposed development, and the proximity of the boundary, the lack of fenestration on the northeastern elevation would not easily be visible when viewing the property from either the front or rear. I therefore have no objections to it in the context of the main issue. Moreover, its treatment would tie in with the modern feel to the extensions as a whole. With this and the above in mind, the proposed development would not harm the character or appearance of the area. Such that it would comply with Policy N1 of The Plan for Stafford Borough (2014) which requires development to take into account local character and context amongst other things.

Conditions

8. The standard time condition and reference to the approved plans are necessary for enforcement purposes. There is sufficient detail on the plans to show the proposed external treatment which, as I have explained above, would be acceptable. No further conditions will be necessary.

Conclusion and Recommendation

9. For the reasons given above, the proposals would comply with the development plan. I therefore recommend the appeal is allowed.

E Clifford

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

10. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed, subject to the conditions set out above.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR