
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 December 2019

by Bhupinder Thandi BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15th January 2020.

Appeal Ref: APP/M3455/D/19/3237845

60 Clermont Avenue, Hanford, Stoke-on-Trent ST4 8QP

- 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 Stephen Wood against the decision of Stoke-on-Trent City Council.
 - The application Ref 64219, dated 28 June 2019, was refused by notice dated 20 August 2019.
 - The development proposed is a roof conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises a detached bungalow occupying a prominent corner position on the junction of Clermont Avenue and Marcel Close. Although properties in Marcel Close are two storey Clermont Avenue is formed of bungalows of a similar design.
4. The dwellings along Clermont Avenue despite some differences are in general harmony with each other in terms of their character and appearance. They have a simple form, low shallow roofs and gaps between them thereby creating a sense of openness in the area.
5. Due to the prominent position of the property the proposal would be clearly visible from within the surrounding area and would draw the eye. It would be visually discordant and adversely affect the character and appearance of the host property and the area.
6. Whilst the proposal would be proportionate to its plot, the combination of the increase in the height of the roof and the dormer windows would markedly change the appearance of the dwelling. It would result in a prominent and incongruous building that would appear unacceptably at odds with the harmonious appearance of properties in Clermont Close.
7. As such I find that the proposal would be contrary to policy CSP1 of the Newcastle-under-Lyme and Stoke-on-Trent Core Spatial Strategy (2009) which

sets out that new development should respect the character, identity and context of an area. The proposal would also be contrary to the similar supporting aims of the Stoke-on-Trent Urban Design Supplementary Planning Document.

Other Matters

8. I note the information provided by the appellant in relation to two other properties in the area. However, I find that their context is not comparable to the appeal site. I also have not been made aware of the individual circumstances that led to them being built. In any case, I have considered the appeal on its own merits and give this aspect of the appellant's argument little weight.
9. I note the appellant's comments that the proposal would improve the house for his family, purchasing a larger dwelling is unaffordable, the local school is in the estate and he wishes to remain in the area. Whilst I have given these matters careful consideration, I am mindful of the advice contained in the Planning Practice Guidance that in general, planning is concerned with land use in the public interest. It is probable that the proposal would remain long after the current personal circumstances cease to be material. For these reasons, I find that this factor is not sufficient to outweigh the harm that I have identified.
10. The support of neighbours and the energy efficiency of the scheme counts neither for nor against the proposal and does not overcome the harm I have identified in relation to the main issue. The appellant's concerns over the application process is not a matter for me in this appeal.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons set out above, the appeal does not succeed.

B Thandi

INSPECTOR