
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 January 2017

by Louise Nurser BA (Hons) Dip UP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 13 February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Y3425/D/16/3165234

375 Sandon Road, Meir Heath, Stoke-on-Trent, Staffordshire ST3 7LJ

- 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 Clive Russell against the decision of Stafford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 16/24759/HOU, dated 20 August 2016, was refused by notice dated 18 October 2016.
 - The development proposed is single storey front bedroom extension. Single storey rear kitchen, study & orangery extensions, raise height and replace bungalow roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for single storey front room extension. Single storey rear kitchen, study & orangery extensions, raise height and replace bungalow roof at 375 Sandon Road, Meir Heath, Stoke-on-Trent, Staffordshire ST3 7LJ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 16/24759/HOU, dated 20 August 2016, and the plans submitted with it, 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: 09/99/242 and 09/99/246.
 - 3) The external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be constructed in the materials shown on plan no. 09/99/242.

Main issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the wider area.

Reasons

3. The host property is a modest bungalow which both parties are agreed has no architectural merit. It sits in a large garden within a string of ribbon development which I understand lies outside of the settlement boundary of Meir Heath. As part of my site visit I observed that the housing which fronts Sandon Road varies in size, age and style. However, the majority of the properties are set back off the road in generous sized plots.
-

4. Policy C5 of the Plan for Stafford Borough¹, (PSB) has as an objective that extensions to residential properties outside of the defined settlement hierarchy should not have an adverse impact on the character of the individual properties or their surroundings.
5. The proposed extension and alterations to the bungalow, which at the time of my site visit appeared to be an empty shell, would clearly increase the floor area and height of the property. This would result in around a 192% increase in floor area. In numerical terms this would not be a proportionate increase as referred to within Policy C5 (ii) of the PSB, and the resultant property would retain little of its original features or appearance.
6. However, I note that the Council accepts that the building is of no architectural merit, and from my site visit I do not consider that in this particular instance, given the generally suburban nature of the neighbouring properties that the proposed extension would have an adverse impact on the character of the surrounding area. Moreover, the extended property would still retain its character as a bungalow and the scale of the extension would not appear disproportionate within the context of the site and surrounding developments.
7. Consequently, I conclude that the proposed development would accord with Policy C5 of the PSB and be consistent with the development plan as a whole.

Conditions

8. I have imposed conditions relating to the commencement of development and the details of the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning. The Council has suggested an additional condition relating to materials as set out in the application forms which accompanied the planning application. However, I consider that the reference to the materials as shown on the approved plans would be sufficient to ensure a satisfactory appearance.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above the appeal should be allowed.

L. Nurser

INSPECTOR

¹ 2011- 2031 adopted 2014