

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 October 2019

by Mr W Johnson BA(Hons) DipTP DipUDR MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25th October 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/M3455/D/19/3234326

151 Abbots Road, Abbey Hulton, Stoke-on-Trent, Staffordshire ST2 8DZ

- 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 Adam Cooke against the decision of Stoke-on-Trent Council.
 - The application Ref 63928, dated 17 April 2019, was refused by notice dated 13 June 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as: 'Two storey side extension providing granny unit'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The appeal scheme was applied for based on providing ancillary accommodation to the main dwelling. I have dealt with the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the appeal site and surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The host property is a semi-detached dwelling occupying a corner plot location. The site is located in a prominent position in the street scene as it forms part of 4no. pairs of dwellings around the junction with Abbots Road, Tanners Road and Uplands Road. The use and siting of dwellings on corner plots is a prominent and distinctive feature throughout the estate, which I find positively contributes to the character of the area.
5. The proposed development seeks to erect a 2-storey side extension on part of the garden to the host dwelling. Whilst there is no specific policy objection to the principle of a residential extension, I note that the appeal scheme would extend a notable width of the building, that would extend much closer to Abbots Road, and significantly beyond the return front building line of its neighbouring properties. I find that this would unacceptably accentuate the appearance of the proposal.
6. I acknowledge that the proposed extension would have an element of subordination to the main dwelling through a lower ridge line and slight set back from the front elevation. However, these design features would not provide sufficient mitigation to overcome the harmful visual effects of the

proposal on the host dwelling, which would be readily visible in the street scene to the detriment of the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

7. My attention has been drawn to No 1 Greenway Place, which is located close to the site and occupies a corner plot and has a 2-storey side extension. Whilst noting the presence of this extension, relatively little detail has been provided regarding the particular planning background to this scheme. Without such information a full and detailed comparison between this development and the case before me cannot be drawn except insofar as I was able to observe and assess the site at my visit. In any event, the fact that apparently a similar extension on a similar property may exist is not a reason, on its own, to allow otherwise unacceptable development.
8. For the above reasons, I therefore conclude that the proposed development would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the appeal site and the surrounding area. This conflicts with the design, character and appearance aims of Policy CSP1 of the Council's Core Spatial Strategy 2006-2026 (2009). It would also fail to accord with guidance set out in the Council's Urban Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2010, and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Other Matters

9. I have also had regard to various other matters raised by the appellant, including his need to develop accommodation for his parents to enable him to provide support and care, and no objections from third parties, but on the evidence before me these are not reasons to grant permission in the face of the harm identified.
10. In addition, the Local Highway Authority raise no objections to the proposal. However, a lack of harm associated with highways is a neutral factor that weighs neither for nor against the development. I have considered this appeal proposal on its own merits and concluded that it would cause harm for the reasons set out above.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

W Johnson

INSPECTOR