
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 September 2025 by J Reed MPlan

Decision by K Allen MEng (Hons) MArch PGCert ARB

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/K3415/D/25/3369245

36 Redlock Field, Lichfield, Staffordshire WS14 0AB

- 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 Conroy Arkill against the decision of Lichfield District Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00389/FUH.
 - The development proposed is 1st floor side extension and garage conversion to create a home office, an additional bedroom and a larger family bathroom
-

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.

Application for Costs

3. An application for costs was made by Conroy Arkill against Lichfield District Council. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Main Issue

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

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal property is a two storey semi-detached dwelling with a gable roof. It is situated in a cul-de-sac of other residential properties with a majority of these also two storey and semi-detached. Whilst there is a mixture of hipped and gable roof forms within the street scene semi-detached pairings of dwellings predominantly possess matching roof forms which creates a pleasant consistency and uniformity to the character and appearance of the area.
6. The proposed first floor extension would not sit above the existing properties ridge height but would project beyond both the front and rear elevation. As a result, the development would appear as an awkward bulky addition to the side of the property which would alter the existing dwelling's character and design. Even though the proposed extension would be set down in its height it would still lack visual subservience to the main dwelling due to its projection beyond the principal elevation.

7. I recognise that the proposed extension would use appropriate materials and be sufficiently separated from the neighbouring properties, however due to its prominent hipped roof form the relationship the appeal dwelling has with its attached neighbour would become unbalanced. As a result, the proposal would unacceptably erode the design quality of the area and would appear as an incongruous addition.
8. I observed on my site visit that there were other first floor and two storey side extensions present on Redlock Field, However, these are setback from the principal elevation and are sensitive to the host dwellings roof form.
9. For the reasons as set out, the proposed first floor extension would have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and area. As such it would fail to comply with Policies CP3 and BE1 of the Lichfield District Local Plan Strategy (2015) which require development to carefully respect the character of the surrounding area in regard to size, scale and design. It would also fail to accord with the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) where it requires development to be well designed and reflect local design policies.
10. Similarly, it would fail to accord with the guidance set out in the District Design Code which advises development to be appropriately designed.

Other Matters

11. Concerns have been raised regarding the Council's conduct during the application stage. Nevertheless, this issue does not relate to the planning merits of the appeal, which must be the focus of my recommendation.

Conclusion and Recommendation

12. I have found that there would be harm to the character and appearance of the area and the host dwelling. The proposed development would therefore conflict with the development plan and there are no other considerations identified, including the Framework, that outweigh this conflict.
13. For the reasons set out above, and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

J Reed

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

K Allen

INSPECTOR