



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 February 2020

by Conor Rafferty LLB (Hons), AIEMA, Solicitor

Decision by V Lucas LLB (Hons) MCD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 March 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/M3455/D/19/3238884

77 Northwood Park Road, Hanley, Stoke-on-Trent, ST16QU

- 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 R Gilbert against the decision of Stoke-on-Trent Council.
 - The application Ref 64055, dated 21 May 2019, was refused by notice dated 25 July 2019
 - The development proposed is a new gable end with balcony to front elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

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

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site is located on Northwood Park Road and comprises a two storey residential property situated in the middle of a standalone group of three detached dwellings opposite a play park. The host property is noticeably larger than the others, having previously been converted from two separate houses. While the frontages of the three properties are varied a certain coherence remains, most notably due to the gable roofs and projections at first floor level. The surrounding area is characterised by its residential nature, consisting primarily of rows of terraced houses. While a gable end design is present on the bay window and porch at the front elevation of the host property, this is not a common characteristic of the area and stands out for this reason.
5. The proposed development relates to the installation of a new gable end with balcony to the front elevation. Whilst matching materials would be used, the proposal would not respect the current character or form of the existing property. The gable end at the front elevation would represent a large and visually dominant addition in relation to the frontage of the property that would not be compatible with the current appearance. It would represent a

bulky feature which, when combined with the bay windows and porch at the dwelling, would result in an awkward and busy frontage.

6. While an attempt has been made to mirror the gable ends of the windows and porch, the resulting difference between the proposal and the remainder of the roof profile at the property would nonetheless result in the gable end appearing out of place on the dwelling. The roof is already stepped in nature and the addition of the proposal would create a complex roof form when taken as a whole that would not respect the character of the property.
7. The proposal would be highly visible within the surrounding area due to the prominent position of the appeal site opposite a play park. In particular it would be experienced alongside the other two dwellings in this group where it would have a dominant visual impact. As a result of the proposal the coherence that exists along the frontages of these dwellings would be significantly reduced, most notably due to loss of the gable roof at the host dwelling. Furthermore, the sizeable and bulky addition would serve to dwarf the properties either side of it. For these reasons the proposal would appear out of place within the immediate streetscene and as such would not respect the character or appearance of the group of properties within which it sits.
8. With regards to the wider surrounds it is recognised that the streetscape is somewhat varied, with the predominant style being rows of terraced houses with differing frontages and facades. However, despite the variety in the area, the scale of the proposal is such that it remains a sizeable addition that does not respect or respond to the surrounding character and appearance. While another gable end design is present on the porch of a property in the same street as the appeal site, this is much less intrusive than the proposed development and respects the scale and design of both the property on which it is located and the surrounding dwellings. Furthermore, the balcony aspect of the proposal represents the first addition of its kind in the area. It appears as a prominent feature that is incongruous in the immediate setting and would not contribute positively to the character or identity of the surrounding area.
9. For all of those reasons I find that the development would have a significantly adverse visual effect on the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area. Accordingly, it would fail to comply with Policy CSP1 of the Newcastle-under-Lyme and Stoke-on-Trent Core Spatial Strategy 2006 – 2026, (adopted October 2009) and the Newcastle-under-Lyme and Stoke-on-Trent Urban Design Guidance Supplementary Planning Document (December 2010), which state that development should contribute positively to the identity and character of an area.

Other considerations

10. The appellant has stated that the proposal would elevate the bland frontage of the property, pointing out the positive impact that the design would have on the host property. This benefit of the development is acknowledged, however the matters raised in this instance do not attract sufficient weight in planning terms to override the harm that would arise.
11. The appellant has further stated that recent additions in the area have shifted the emphasis of the surrounds from primarily terraced houses to detached dwellings. However, no information on the precise nature or location of these other additions has been provided, nor on their comparability to the

development in question. It was clear from the site visit that the predominant style of the surrounding area remains that of terraced houses. Furthermore, the appeal is decided on its own site-specific circumstances and reference to other development nearby does not outweigh the harm identified above.

Conclusion and Recommendation

12. Having had regard to all matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

C Rafferty

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

13. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report, and, on that basis, I agree that the appeal should be dismissed.

V Lucas

INSPECTOR