The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 23 May 2017

by Mrs A Fairclough MA BSc(Hons) LLB(Hons) PGDip (Barrister) MRTPI IHBC

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

Decision date: 20 June 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/P3420/D/17/3172714
57 Beresford Crescent, Newcastle Under Lyme ST5 3RQ

- 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 and Mrs Daniel Mullineux against the decision of Newcastle-Under-Lyme Borough Council.
- The application Ref: 17/00020/FUL, dated 13 January 2017 was refused by notice dated 13 March 2017.
- The development proposed is described as "(1) single storey rear extension and (2) extension to the first floor to create additional bedroom space".

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to the extension to the first floor to create additional bedroom space.

2. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to the single storey rear extension and planning permission is granted at 57 Beresford Crescent, Newcastle Under Lyme ST5 3RQ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref: 17/00020/FUL, dated 13 January 2017, and 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 materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

   3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans so far as relevant to that part of the development hereby permitted: Plans submitted on 13 January 2017 Ref-PL01, PL02 and PL03.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this case is the effect of the single storey rear extension and the first floor side extension on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene.

Reasons

4. No. 57 Beresford Crescent is a semi-detached dwelling, which is located within a residential area characterised by semi-detached dwellings. It is elevated above Beresford Crescent, which has a slight incline. The proposed single

storey rear extension would project some 3.3m rearwards and would have a mono-pitched roof. In my view it would be subordinate and would complement the existing building in terms of form and design and as such would be acceptable.

5. The first floor bedroom extension would be positioned above a flat roofed side extension to the rear of the property. It would also be behind an existing 2-storey side extension with a hipped roof which is lower than the original hipped roof on the appeal dwelling. The existing roof above the side extension would be altered so that it would increase in height and mass such that the new ridge would align with the ridge on the original dwelling.

6. This would create a bulkier side extension with a larger roof form. I consider that this would not respect the design, scale and form of the host dwelling. In addition, although matching materials would be used, I consider that the proposal would create a discordant and dominant feature on the appeal dwelling due to its increased ridge length and roof form, which would detract materially from the character of the original dwelling.

7. Furthermore, I consider that the increase in roof mass would harm the symmetry and balance of this pair of semi-detached houses when viewed from Beresford Crescent. Given its slightly elevated position above the road, it would be prominent and this emphasises the detrimental effect of the extension on the integrity of the original design of the group of dwellings on this part of Beresford Crescent. Thus it would not respect the character and appearance of the street scene.

8. I note that the appellant states that the front wall of the existing side extension aligns with the main elevation and the front roof slope follows the roof slope of the original dwelling, albeit it has a lower ridge. I also acknowledge that to create a first floor extension to the rear with a lower ridge would be more expensive and difficult. However, these are not adequate reasons to justify a scheme that would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling, the pair of semi-detached dwelling or the street scene.

9. The appellant refers to other examples of roof extensions in the locality. I am not aware of the full background of these schemes. I saw that one related to a side dormer and another that related to a hip to gable extension. I have also been referred to the side extension to the adjacent unattached property which includes a continuous ridge with increased roof mass. In any case, the first two examples differ to the appeal before me as the roof extension is contained within the original dwelling footprint. With regard to the side extension on the adjacent dwelling, it is not situated in as prominent a position as the appeal dwelling on Beresford Crescent in that it is set at a lower level than the appeal dwelling by around 1.5m. Moreover, this scheme was determined on policies from an earlier development plan which has been replaced. Furthermore, I am required to determine each case on its own merits in the light of current planning policy. Therefore, I consider that the presence of other extensions in the area do not outweigh the harmful effect that the proposed side extension would have on the appeal dwelling, this pair of semi-detached dwellings and the street scene.

Conclusions and Conditions

10. For the reasons given above, the proposed single storey rear extension would not conflict with saved Policy H18 of the *Newcastle Under Lyme Local Plan 2011* adopted 2003 (LP) or with Policy CSP1 of the *Newcastle-Under-Lyme and Stoke On Trent Core Spatial Strategy 2006 – 2026* dated 2009 (CS). As these policies are consistent with the *National Planning Policy Framework* (the Framework), I accord them considerable weight.

11. As this element of the scheme is separate in nature, planning permission can be granted as part of a split decision. The Council suggested three conditions relating to matching materials and that development should be undertaken in accordance with the submitted plans. I agree with the Council that a plans condition should be imposed as this provides certainty and that a matching materials condition is reasonable and necessary to ensure that the extension would complement the character and appearance of the host dwelling.

12. However, the proposed the first floor extension to create additional bedroom space would conflict with the abovementioned LP and CS Policies. It would also conflict with the guidance in the Council's *Urban Design Guidance Supplementary Planning Document* (2010), which states, amongst other things, that extensions to dwellings should be well designed and contribute positively to the townscape character. Moreover, it would be contrary to *the* Framework, which states that new development should always seek to secure high quality design and that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, is indivisible from good planning, and should contribute positively to making places better for people. The appeal in relation to this part of the proposal therefore fails.

13. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed in part and dismissed in part.

A L Fairclough

INSPECTOR