

Application No: CH/17/221

Received: 23/05/2017

Location: 6 Coppice Court, WS11 1PB

Parish: Non Parish Area

Ward: Cannock South Ward

Description: Residential development: Two Storey Side Extension

Application Type: Full

Recommendation: That the report be noted.

On 25th October 2017 Planning Committee resolved to refuse the above application on the following grounds

‘The proposed development would result in the development of the whole of the grass strip between the existing dwelling and the entrance to Coppice Court and as such would constitute an overdevelopment of the site and an intrusion into the sense of openness that was part of the design concept of the original estate to the significant detriment of the street scene contrary to Policy CP3 of the Cannock Chase Local Plan and the NPPF.’

The applicant subsequently appealed the decision and the appeal decision has now been received. The appeal has been upheld and planning permission has been granted.

The appeal decision is attached for information.

PAGE INTENTIONALLY BLANK



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 March 2018

by F Rafiq BSc (Hons), MCD, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17th April 2018

Appeal Ref: APP/X3405/D/17/3192979

6 Coppice Court, Cannock, WS11 1PB

- 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 Brendan Gore against the decision of Cannock Chase District Council.
 - The application Ref CH/17/221 dated 8 May 2017 was refused by notice dated 25 October 2017.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two storey side extension at 6 Coppice Court, Cannock, WS11 1PB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref CH/17/221, dated 8 May 2017, 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 the following approved plans: Dwg No's: 2011-008-01 (Existing Plans & Elevations), 2011-008-02 Rev B (Proposed Plans & Elevations).
 - 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.
 - 4) Notwithstanding the details on the submitted plans, the extension hereby permitted shall not be occupied until the first floor bathroom window on the rear (south-eastern) elevation has been fitted with obscured glazing, and no part of that window that is less than 1.7 metres above the floor of the room in which it is installed shall be capable of being opened. Details of the type of obscured glazing shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority before the window is installed and once installed, the obscured glazing and non-opening shall be retained thereafter.
 - 5) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 as amended (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no windows or other
-

openings additional to those shown on the approved plans shall be inserted in the side elevation of the extension hereby permitted.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a semi-detached dwelling which is one of six similar properties on Coppice Court. The wider area comprises mainly of similar semi-detached dwellings, that are constructed in brick and have pitched roofs. These features, as well as the generally closely spaced nature of dwellings, gives the area a cohesive and attractive character.
4. The proposal seeks permission for a two-storey side extension. I acknowledge the development would occupy a currently open, landscaped area, but I consider the presence of such spaces makes a limited contribution to the character of the area. Reference has also been made to the resultant appeal dwelling having a dominating effect on other properties on Coppice Court. The extension would however be set in from the front and rear building lines of the main dwelling, and also have a lower ridge height. As such, and given the overall architectural style, roof form and the materials proposed are all in keeping with the design of the host dwelling, I do not find that it would have a detrimental effect on the streetscene.
5. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would not have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the host property or the area. There would therefore be no conflict with Policy CP3 of the Cannock Chase Local Plan, which seeks, amongst other matters, development to be well-related to existing buildings and their surroundings. There would also be no conflict with guidance within Chapter 7 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Other Matters

6. Concerns have been raised in relation to the loss of privacy and overlooking. The extension would however be sufficiently separated from properties to the front and rear, to not result in any harmful effects in this respect. It would also be no closer than the existing dwelling to other properties on Coppice Court, and whilst it may result in loss of light in the Court area, given the position of the extension, it would not adversely affect the living conditions of the surrounding occupiers within their properties.
7. I have considered the highway related concerns that have been raised, including reference to visibility and parking. Staffordshire County Council Highways have not raised an objection and based on my site observations, I do not consider that visibility around Coppice Court would be unduly impacted. The appeal dwelling would also continue to have two parking spaces, which I consider to be adequate for the size of the dwelling, despite the addition of a third bedroom.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons set out above and having taken into account all other matters raised, including reference to overdevelopment, I conclude the appeal should be allowed.

Conditions

9. The Council have suggested a number of conditions. I consider the standard implementation condition and a condition for the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans to be necessary for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning. I will also impose a condition in relation to materials in the interests of the character and appearance of the host property and area. A condition is required to ensure the rear first floor window in the extension is obscure glazed and also non-opening below 1.7m to ensure the living conditions of surrounding occupiers is not adversely affected. The same condition is not however required for the WC room, as its ground floor position limits overlooking of neighbouring residential occupiers. A further condition is required to prevent the insertion of windows in the side wall of the proposed extension to maintain privacy for neighbours. I have considered the condition relating to the retention of the parking spaces but as these spaces are existing, I do not consider that this condition is required. I have amended the wording of some of the conditions without changing their overall aim.

F Rafiq

INSPECTOR