
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 October 2016

by Anne Jordan BA (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 3rd November 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/P3420/D/16/3155967

134 Chatterley Drive, Kidsgrove, Stoke-On-Trent, ST74LL

- 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 Mrs P Daley against the decision of Newcastle-Under-Lyme Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 16/00241/FUL, dated 23 March 2016, was refused by notice dated 10 June 2016.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side and single storey front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. 134 Chatterley Drive forms one half of a pair of modern semi-detached dwellings, which sit in a predominantly residential area. The appeal seeks to renovate and extend the property with the addition of a large two storey extension to the side, and a further single storey element which would run across part of the original dwelling and all of the extension.
 4. As the building is set behind the adjoining building line the works would not be prominently visible on the approach from the south. Nevertheless, in views on the approach from the north, and from the front of the building, the excessive width of the proposal, which would almost double the width of the original dwelling, would unbalance the appearance of the pair. This effect would be exacerbated by the proposed alterations to fenestration which would increase the proportion of brickwork in relation to windows on the front elevation in stark contrast with that on the adjoining dwelling. These changes, taken together, would radically alter the appearance of the host property to the extent that it would appear incongruous and fail to assimilate comfortably in the streetscene.
 5. I note that in the wider area there is some variation in appearance of dwellings and that other properties have been extended. However, alterations are generally proportionate in form and do not detract from the wider streetscene. In contrast, due to its scale and form the proposal before me would have an
-

intrusive and discordant appearance which would be harmful to both the appearance of the host dwelling, and the character of the area. Therefore, whilst the Council may have approved larger extensions elsewhere in the Borough, I am satisfied that such instances do not justify the harm that would arise in this case.

6. I therefore conclude that the proposal would fail to comply with Policy H18 of the *Newcastle under Lyme Local Plan* and Policy CSP1 of the *Newcastle under Lyme and Stoke on Trent Core Spatial Strategy* which together seek to ensure that the design of extensions contributes positively to the character of the original dwelling and surrounding area. It would also conflict with guidance within the *National Planning Policy Framework* which advises that permission should be refused for development of poor design, which fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area.
7. I take into account that the proposal would provide accommodation for the appellant's family. Whilst I have some sympathy for this requirement, I do not consider that the harm that would arise from an extension of the form proposed would be outweighed by this benefit in this case. Accordingly, for the reasons outlined above, and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

Anne Jordan

INSPECTOR