



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 February 2020

by Alexander Walker MPlan MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26th February 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/M3455/W/19/3240402

Land adjacent 293 Leek Road, Stoke-on-Trent, ST4 2BU

- 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 Mrs A Begum against the decision of Stoke-on-Trent Council.
 - The application Ref 64191, dated 23 June 2019, was refused by notice dated 14 August 2019.
 - The development proposed is a new dwelling house and partial demolition of single storey side extension and garage to adjacent property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. This stretch of Leek Road comprises a mix of uses. The south east side of the road consists of various commercial, retail, leisure and educational uses. The north west side is predominantly residential, comprising semi-detached and small blocks of terraced properties, which follow uniform building lines and are separated by, generally, uniform gaps, which creates a visually appealing rhythm.
4. The appeal site forms part of the side garden to 293 Leek Road and unlike other gaps between this side of the road it is much wider, comparable to the plot size of the adjacent dwellings.
5. The proposed dwelling would be detached and have a gap either side. As a result of the proposed dwelling being wider than the adjacent properties, these gaps would be discernibly narrower than the others along this side of the road. Whilst I acknowledge that the existing gap does not reflect the prevailing gap sizes, it nevertheless makes a positive contribution to the openness of the area. The proposed width of the dwelling and the narrow gaps either side would create a form of development that would unduly disrupt the rhythm of the dwellings within this row of houses and represent a cramped, overdevelopment of the site.
6. I acknowledge that the architectural features of the dwelling would be characteristic of the area and that it would be a detached property. However, I

do not consider that these are matters that outweigh the failure of the proposal to reflect the well-established pattern and grain of development.

7. I find therefore that the proposal would significantly harm the character and appearance of the area, contrary to Policy CSP1 of the Newcastle-under-Lyme and Stoke-on-Trent Core Spatial Strategy 2009, which, amongst other matters, seeks to ensure that new development contributes positively to an area's identity and heritage (both natural and built) in terms of scale, density and layout. It would also fail to accord with the guidance set out in the Newcastle-under-Lyme and Stoke-on-Trent Urban Design Guidance Supplementary Planning Document 2010, which similarly seeks to ensure that development helps to enhance the character of the area. Furthermore, it would fail to accord with the design objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework).

Other Matters

8. The proposal would make a positive, albeit limited, contribution to the supply of housing in the area, which weighs in its favour. However, given the scale of the proposal, I attribute this benefit limited weight.
9. The appellant has suggested that a condition could be imposed restricting the sale of the property, were I minded to allow the appeal. However, despite there being no suggested wording of such a condition, or evidence as to how it would overcome the harm I have identified above, I am not satisfied that such a condition would meet the relevant tests set out in paragraph 55 of the Framework, in particular it would not be reasonable.

Conclusion

10. Whilst the proposal would make a positive contribution to the housing supply for the area, I do not consider that this outweighs the significant harm the proposal would have on the character and appearance of the area.
11. For the reasons given above, the appeal is dismissed.

Alexander Walker

INSPECTOR