
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 March 2020

by Diane Cragg DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date:

Appeal Ref: APP/M3455/W/19/3243355

Brothers Motors Ltd c/o Top Gear Stoke, Pitt Street East, Burslem, Stoke-on-Trent ST6 2EQ

- 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 F Mubarik (TG Car Sales) against the decision of Stoke-on-Trent City Council.
 - The application Ref 64099, dated 24 May 2019, was refused by notice dated 1 August 2019.
 - The development proposed is additional portacabin over existing cabin.
-

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. The appeal site is located at the end of a row of commercial buildings surrounded by roads on three sides. The area is generally commercial in nature with a mix of modern and more traditional brick buildings. Opposite the site there is a large open site in the early stages of redevelopment. The prevailing character of the immediate area is of large commercial buildings and open spaces predominantly used as car parks. The appeal site is particularly prominent because of its location at a point where a number of roads converge.
4. The appeal site boundary is partially defined by typical palisade security fencing with mostly low walls and vegetation in front. The existing portacabin is sited adjacent to the gable elevation of the neighbouring commercial building. The site is used for the sale of cars. The cars are parked close together so that the existing portable building, when viewed in the context of the parked cars and palisade fencing, is not particularly prominent.
5. An additional portacabin on top of the existing cabin would be significantly more prominent because it would be seen above the parked cars and the fencing. Although the surrounding buildings are commercial, they are mostly designed having regard to the traditional brick buildings in the area. Because of its utilitarian form and its location on a prominent corner site, the portacabin would draw the eye and it would appear as an incongruous and unsightly addition to the street scene.

6. I acknowledge that there is sometimes a justification for such a building to be positioned on a temporary basis, but there is no explanation as to why the building is needed or any indication that it is sought on a temporary basis.
7. Overall, I conclude that the proposed portacabin would harm the character and appearance of the area, in conflict with CSP1 of the Newcastle-under-Lyme and Stoke-on-Trent Core Spatial Strategy 2006- 2026 adopted October 2009 which seeks to ensure that new development is well designed. In this respect the development also conflicts with the National Planning Policy Framework in so far as it relates to design.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given above the appeal is dismissed.

Diane Cragg

INSPECTOR