



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 June 2019

by Julie Dale Clark BA (Hons) DipTP MCD DMS MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28th August 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/P3420/D/19/3225555

28A Halfway Place, Newcastle Under Lyme ST5 6EQ

- 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 David Hulme against the decision of Newcastle Under Lyme Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 18/01001/FUL, dated 19 December 2018, was refused by notice dated 15 February 2019.
 - The development proposed is retrospective application for dormers to existing bungalow front and rear together with a flat roof infill area to form storage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The proposal includes a single storey infill element which the Council do not object to and neither do I. The assessment therefore is based on the front and rear dormers.

Main Issue

3. I consider that the main issue is the effect of the dormers on the character and appearance of the area and the original building.

Reasons

4. Halfway Place is a cul-de-sac and the appeal site is a detached building located at the end of the cul-de-sac. It was built with planning permission for a 'granny annexe'¹.
5. Core Strategy CSP1² relates to the quality of design and Local Plan Policy H18³ sets out criteria for residential extensions. In particular extensions should be subordinate to the design of the original dwelling and not detract from its character. Further guidance regarding design is provided in the Council's SPD⁴.

¹ Local Planning Authority Reference : 14/00172/FUL.

² Local Development Framework Newcastle-Under- Lyme and Stoke-On-Trent Core Spatial Strategy 2006-2026, Adopted October 2009.

³ Newcastle Under Lyme Local Plan 2011, Adopted October 2003.

⁴ Newcastle-under-Lyme and Stoke-on-Trent Urban Design Guidance, Supplementary Planning Guidance December 2010 (SPD).

The National Planning Policy Framework⁵ also places significant emphasis on good design.

6. The dormers have been erected and are both to the front and the rear of the building. I consider that the dormers significantly change the character and appearance of the building which, according to the Council, was designed as an ancillary building providing living accommodation. Although it is set back from the cul-de-sac and partly obscured by No 28 and a garage, it can be partly seen from the cul-de-sac. Due to the large and prominent dormers, it is of a design that does not appear as an ancillary outbuilding but as a disproportionate, top heavy building.
7. I am mindful that the appellant seems to have been advised that planning permission was not required and I do not doubt the standard of work carried out. However, the dormers pay no regard to the design of the original building. They have introduced a dominant element to what would have been a modest building.
8. I have considered all other matters raised but none alter my conclusion. I conclude that the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area and on the building itself and conflict with the policies and SPD referred to. The appeal therefore fails.

J D Clark

INSPECTOR

⁵ Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government National Planning Policy Framework, July 2018 (the Framework).