



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 December 2020

by Chris Forrett BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21st December 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/C3430/D/20/3246964

Somerford, Hawthorne Lane, Codsall, Staffordshire WV8 2DA

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr A Qualters against the decision of South Staffordshire Council.
 - The application Ref 19/00537/FUL, dated 28 June 2019, was refused by notice dated 28 January 2020.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of existing ground floor store and erection of first floor rear extension to existing bungalow.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the demolition of existing ground floor store and erection of first floor rear extension to existing bungalow at Somerford, Hawthorne Lane, Codsall, Staffordshire WV8 2DA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 19/00537/FUL, dated 28 June 2019, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Location Plan; 17.290.06; 17.290.10 rev D; 17.290.16 Rev E and 17.290.20.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is located at the edge of a residential area of Codsall. Hawthorne Lane itself consists of a variety of housing types and designs including semi-detached and detached two storey properties, bungalows, and bungalows with accommodation within their roof space. As a result, as I noted at my site visit, there is a wide variety of different dwelling heights on the street. The most relevant of these to the appeal proposal is in the relationship between Little Holme, a one and a half storey property with a crown roof, and The Stork which is a bungalow with a hipped roof.

4. From the Council officers' report planning permission has already been granted for a similar development¹. From the information before me, the main difference between that scheme and the one before me is in relation to the height of the roof, which in the appeal scheme would be around 0.4 metres higher than the existing property and that of the planning permission already granted.
5. Whilst the increase in roof height would inevitably result in some change in the massing and bulk of the existing built form, this would not be significantly different to that already granted planning permission. This is also the case in respect of the rearward extent of the extension which would be in line with the rear wall of the existing flat roofed single storey extension. Significantly, it would be broadly in line with the rear wall of Stoven (the property on the northern side of the appeal property) and would not dominate its rear aspect.
6. Whilst the extension would be a greater height than the existing dwelling, when the proposal is taken as a whole, the resultant building would appear as one dwelling and would not be overly dominant or out of scale with the existing development in the area. It would also successfully integrate the existing dwelling into the overall design. Furthermore, the difference in building heights between the appeal property and Stoven would not be significantly different to that between The Stork and Little Holme.
7. To my mind, the limited increase in the height of the roof would not therefore have a significant impact on the streetscene or the general character and appearance of the area particularly when the wide variety of house designs and roof heights is taken into account.
8. For the above reasons the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the area and would accord with Policy EQ11 of the Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2012) which amongst other matters seeks to ensure that all developments are of the highest quality which take into account local character and distinctiveness and contribute positively to the streetscene and surrounding buildings.

Conditions

9. The Council has provided a list of suggested conditions in their appeal questionnaire that it considers would be appropriate. Other than the standard time limit condition, it is necessary to ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans for the reason of certainty. In the interests of the character and appearance of the area, a condition relating to matching materials is also necessary.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Chris Forrett

INSPECTOR

¹ Reference 18/00767/FUL