
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 January 2017

by I Radcliffe BSc(Hons) MRTPI MCIEH DMS

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

Decision date: 13th January 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/M3455/D/16/3162607

190 Clanway Street, Tunstall, Stoke-on-Trent ST6 5UJ

- 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 & Mrs Marsden against the decision of Stoke-on-Trent City Council.
 - The application Ref 60121, dated 20 July 2016, was refused by notice dated 13 September 2016.
 - The development proposed is an extension to the rear and side to form new bedrooms and open living area.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for an extension to the rear and side to form new bedrooms and open living area at 190 Clanway Street, Tunstall, Stoke-on-Trent ST6 5UJ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 60121, dated 20 July 2016, 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 and Block Plan, Planning Drawing ref JPK/16/3656/1 A
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. Clanway Street, in the vicinity of the appeal site, is predominantly characterised by modest semi-detached bungalows. The symmetrical appearance of these regularly spaced dwellings, and their set back from the highway behind front gardens, has resulted in a pleasantly designed suburban environment.
 4. The proposed extension would be set well down from the height of the bungalow's roof and would be set well back from its front elevation. As a result, it would respect the form of the dwelling and would not unbalance the appearance of the semi-detached pair of which it forms a part.
-

5. The extension would double the length of the western side of the dwelling and the overall footprint of the property. Set close to, and following the side boundary, which angles away from the bungalow, the Council is concerned that the long flank wall of the extension would be readily apparent in public views and appear awkward and incongruous.
6. However, the lower level of the site with respect to the street and its unattached neighbour, No 188, would reduce the perceived height of the flank wall which would be only slightly above the height of the side boundary fence. This would have the effect of reducing its perceived scale and mass. Furthermore, due to the location of the property, off a minor spur to the cul-de-sac's turning head, the flank wall would only be glimpsed in the briefest of public views. Consequently, the well composed subservient front elevation of the proposal would define the contribution of the extension to the streetscene rather than its long flank elevation.
7. Taking all these matters into account, I therefore conclude that the proposed development would be well designed and complement the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore comply with policy CSP1 of the Newcastle-under-Lyme and Stoke-on-Trent Core Strategy and policy R23 of the supplementary planning document 'Urban Design Guidance'. These policies require the protection of the character and appearance of a locality through high quality design that respects local design features. As it is well designed, it would also comply with the National Planning Policy Framework. The appeal should therefore succeed.
8. For the avoidance of doubt, and in the interests of proper planning, development needs to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans. In order that the materials used in the extension complement the existing building, and its surroundings, further details are necessary. I have required these matters by condition.

Ian Radcliffe

Inspector