



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 March 2020

by Edwin Maund BA (Hons) MSc Dip UP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 31st March 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/B3438/D/20/3244150

306 Ash Bank Road, Werrington, Staffordshire ST9 0JS

- 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 Chris Brennan against the decision of Staffordshire Moorlands District Council.
 - The application Ref SMD/2019/0577, dated 19 September 2019, was refused by notice dated 3 December 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as 'Two storey pitched roof side extension to existing dwelling, raising of existing garage roof and conversion to study'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Issue

2. The Council have referred to policies from the Emerging Local Plan within their delegated report but have not relied on them within the reason for refusal. I have been given limited information in respect of the status of the emerging plan. I have therefore given these policies no weight in the consideration of this appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect that the proposed extension would have on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the wider area.

Reasons

4. Ash Bank Road is a main thoroughfare with wide verges, with properties generally set well back from the carriageway giving a feeling of spaciousness. The land rises from south to north with the properties opposite the appeal site raised above the carriageway reflecting the natural land profile.
5. The properties in the main are detached or semidetached two storey dwellings, interspersed with bungalows. The properties are predominantly brick with tiled roofs, but occasional rendered properties are also apparent. With occasional street trees, whilst being a busy road it has a pleasant feel with generous space about the properties.
6. The appeal property is a detached house on the south side of the road sitting on a generous plot between a bungalow to the east and forward of a pair of semidetached houses to the west. The current property has a traditional two

storey bay window at the front, with hipped roof behind, creating an attractive traditional red brick property.

7. Due to the land levels, the generous space to the side of the property and the neighbouring property being a bungalow, the east side of the property is particularly noticeable when viewed from this side.
8. The Council considers the use of render as an inappropriate material, this though has not been supported by any specific policy, nor can it be said to be alien in this location where other properties are already treated in this way. Whilst it would materially change the appearance of the whole property, it would not of itself be out of keeping in this location and I do not consider this element on its own would harm the character or appearance of the host property or area.
9. The two-storey side extension whilst set back marginally from the front elevation, would have a similar ridge height and be of similar width to the host property. As such it competes with the original dwelling, rather than appearing subservient to it. With the large double garage door at ground level and the eaves dormers, it would be a marked contrast in style to the current property.
10. The combination of the scale, detailing and style results in an overly dominant extension which would be incongruous in this location and consequently harms, the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the wider area.
11. The appeal scheme would therefore be contrary to policy DC1 of the Staffordshire Moorlands Core Strategy (2014) which amongst other things, seeks to promote a positive sense of place respecting the scale, character and appearance of the area.
12. The Council also considers the Staffordshire Moorlands Design Guide SPD and the New dwellings and extension to dwellings SPG (2018) apply to this development. These both advise that new extensions should generally be subservient to the host property and compliment rather than dominate the existing development. I do not consider this has been achieved in this case and the proposed extension would harm the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Other Matters

13. The appellant has indicated the additional accommodation is required to meet the family requirements, this though is a private matter to which I give limited weight in determining the appeal and does not outweigh the harm that would arise to the character and appearance of the dwelling or the area.
14. The alterations to the garage are not referenced to in the reason for refusal and I see little reason to disagree in this respect, it being a modest alteration to this side of the property. Nevertheless, I have not issued a split decision as distinguishing this part of the scheme from the whole when taking into account the external materials proposed is not practicable.
15. The neighbour at No 308 has expressed concern about loss of light and dominance due to the proximity of the extension to the party boundary and the scale and relative height of the extension. As I am dismissing the appeal on the main issue for the reasons given above, I have not considered this matter further.

Conclusions

16. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Edwin Maund

INSPECTOR