



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: 13 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/K3415/D/25/3369791

17 Hillside, Lichfield, Staffordshire WS14 9DQ

- 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 Mrs Joanna Rowbury against the decision of Lichfield District Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00343/FUH.
 - The development proposed described as 'conversion of existing outside storage area to "Part Storage/Part Hobby Room" to include a new flat roof.'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for the conversion of existing outside storage area to Part Storage/Part Hobby Room to include a new flat roof at 17 Hillside, Lichfield, Staffordshire WS14 9DQ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 25/00343/FUH 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 2506-01, 2506-02 and 2506-03.

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.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on highway safety with specific regard to parking provision.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site is a two storey detached property situated on a corner plot. A detached garage and off street parking space is provided to the rear. Properties on Hillside share a similar arrangement possessing garages and off street parking.
5. At the time of my visit the area appeared quiet. Cars were parked on many of the driveways, with sparse levels of on street parking. Although my observations were a snapshot in time, I have little evidence to suggest they represent an atypical scenario. Overall, Hillside did not appear to be experiencing any significant degree of parking stress.

6. No specific travel plan has been provided for the site nor the wider area. That said, the site is in a reasonably accessible location with bus stops close by. Despite there being no parking controls in the immediate area, my observations above suggest there is not currently a high level of demand that would necessitate this.
7. The Council's Sustainable design supplementary planning document (2015) (the SPD) sets out amongst other things that 3 and 4 bedroom properties require the provision of 2 parking spaces per dwelling. The appeal site's current situation reflects this guidance with 1 driveway space and a garage for a single vehicle. However, the SPD also outlines that the standards will be applied in a flexible manner having regard to location and parking needs.
8. The appellant asserts that the garage is currently used for storage and is not used for parking. It is highly probable that many garages in the area are used for purposes other than parking. In such circumstances, including the appellant's current situation, overflow parking would, be accommodated on the unrestricted highway. As such, there would be no discernible change to the parking provision currently provided as a result of the proposal. I have no substantive evidence to suggest the current arrangement is causing harm to highway safety through either cars parked causing an obstruction or inhibiting the free flow of traffic.
9. For the reasons set out, the proposal would not result in harm to highway safety, with specific regard to parking provision. It would accord with Core Policies 1, 3, and 5 and Policies ST2 and BE1 of the Lichfield District Local Plan Strategy (2015). In respect of this issue, these policies require appropriate provision to be made for off street parking in development proposals.
10. The proposal would also accord with the guidance set out in the SPD which sets out recommended parking guidance.

Other Matters

11. Third parties have raised concerns regarding encroachment to neighbouring boundaries, damage to neighbouring property and a legal power of attorney over the residence by neighbours. However, these are not matters for consideration within the appeal process.
12. I have had regard to concerns raised by third parties about the impact the proposal would have on the character and appearance of the area. However, the domestic scale and detailed design of the development does not result in an adverse effect on the overall character or appearance of the area. Concerns were also raised regarding a loss of light and a loss of privacy. However, any impact on light or privacy due to the increase in height and roof alterations would not be so significant as to be unacceptable.

Conditions

13. In order to meet the interests of timeliness of the development and the identification of plans I have attached planning conditions to reflect these.

Conclusion and Recommendation

14. The appeal scheme would comply with the development plan. There is nothing sufficiently compelling to suggest a decision other than in accordance therewith. I therefore recommend that the appeal should be allowed.

J Reed

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

K Allen

INSPECTOR