The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 September 2019

by Karen Taylor MSC URP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: Wednesday, 09 October 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/P3420/D/19/3231348
61 Oakdene Avenue, Newcastle Under Lyme ST5 8HQ

- 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 Ben Springett against the decision of Newcastle-Under-Lyme Borough Council.
- The application Ref 19/00136/FUL, dated 26 February 2019, was refused by notice dated 26 April 2019.
- The development proposed is a two storey side extension, two storey rear extension and single storey rear extension.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is within a predominantly residential area characterised by semi-detached houses. The property forms a pair of semi-detached dwellings of similar appearance in width, characterised with identical features including hipped roofs. Despite some variation in form, the properties in the area present a discreet arrangement that appreciably contributes towards the local character.

4. The width of the proposed two storey extension to the side would be excessive as it would be almost the same width as the existing dwelling itself, even though it would be slightly set back from the front of the property and sit below the main roof of the house and be of materials to match. Furthermore, the length would project some considerable distance to the rear and wrap around creating a further imposing large two storey addition on the rear elevation. The sheer scale of the proposed extensions would appear as a dominant addition to the side and rear elevations and would not appear subservient to the host dwelling. This would result in a detrimental impact to its character and appearance.

5. In addition, the location of the property along the road would result in the proposed side extension being clearly visible in the street scene, particularly due to the open aspect of the frontage with the driveway. When this is

combined with its overall scale, substantial width, minimal setback and excessive length of the roof ridge across the host property it would create an unbalanced and negative appearance to these symmetrical properties. Accordingly, it would detract from the character and appearance of both properties and the street scene.

6. The Council consider that a terracing effect would be caused if No.59 were to propose a similar extension. No.59 has a single storey detached garage adjoining the boundary, there is no development proposed that would represent similarities to that of this appeal before me and this would be a matter of future consideration by the Council. However, I consider there is sufficient distance between the proposed development and the boundary of No.59, as such there would be no terracing effect, but this does not outweigh the other harm I have identified above.

7. I conclude that the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property and the area. Therefore, it would be contrary to Policy H18 of the Newcastle-under-Lyme Local Plan, (2011) and Policy CSP1 of the Newcastle-under-Lyme and Stoke-on-Trent Core Spatial Strategy (2006-2026). The aims of these policies are that new development is well designed to respect the character, identity and context; the form, size and location of each extension should be subordinate to the design of the original dwellings and the extension should not detract materially from the character of the original dwelling or from the integrity that form the street scene.

8. I also find it would be at odds with the guidance R23, in the Supplementary Planning Document, Newcastle-Under-Lyme and Stoke-on-Trent Urban Design Guidance (Residential design guidance) that seeks to ensure house extensions on the frontage must not unbalance the rhythm and extensions should be a seamless extension to the form and scale of the original building and clearly subservient.

Other Matters

9. I have been referred to other developments within the street. However, I do not have full details of these and so cannot be certain that the circumstances are the same. In any event, those that I saw do not change the prevailing character of the area in order to justify the development before me. In any case I have considered the appeal proposal on its own merits.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Karen Taylor

INSPECTOR