The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 February 2021

by Paul Cooper MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 March 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/M3455/D/20/3264374
7 Amherst Place, Barlaston, Stoke-on-Trent ST12 9FB

- 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 S Mitchell against the decision of Stoke-on-Trent Council.
- The application Ref 65786, dated 17 September 2020, was refused by notice dated 20 November 2020.
- The development proposed is single storey rear extension and replacement single storey garage.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for single storey rear extension and replacement single storey garage at 7 Amherst Place, Barlaston, Stoke-on-Trent ST12 9FB in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 65786, dated 17 September 2020, subject to the following conditions:-

   1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.

   2) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

   3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans:-

      Survey as existing (January 2020)

      Planning 8 (October 2020)

Procedural Matters

2. The description of development in the banner above was modified with the approval of both parties. The original description was 'single storey extension and alterations to existing garage'. There appears to be some dispute between the parties as to the extent of works to the garage and whether it is replacement or alteration, but as both parties have approved the revised description, I have used that accordingly.

3. The appeal site is located within the Green Belt. The Council considers that the appeal scheme would not represent inappropriate development in the Green Belt and I have no reason to take a different view.

Main Issue

4. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. The host property is located in a residential estate, adjacent the junction with Waterford Crescent. Dwellings on that side of Amherst Place are large in size, mainly with double garages close to the side elevations, set back from the front elevation, with the driveway in front of the garages.

6. A previous appeal (APP/M3455/D/20/3250499) was dismissed, due to the impact of the garage extension. being effectively a two-storey extension. The Inspector found no issue with the rear extension and considered that there would be sufficient private amenity space remaining after the rear extension and the increased footprint of the garage were taken into consideration. I have no reason to differ from these findings in relation to these matters.

7. The current appeal now just lengthens and widens the existing garage, not adding a additional storey, attaching it to the side of the existing dwelling, and keeps the rear extension at the back of the house.

8. There is still some uniformity in the locality regarding position of garages and design of the same. Although I have been supplied with other approvals where changes have been made there is still a general rhythm to the overall development style of the residential area.

9. I find that the revised scheme, that retains the design profile of the existing garage in terms of the front elevation is modest in its overall sizing, where the only visible change to the front elevation would be the widening of the garage to attach it to the host dwelling. I find the projection to the rear to be acceptable and overall, the main body of the garage is unaffected in terms of size and roof design. When looked at from the street scene, there would be very little external difference as the majority of any impact is to the rear, rather than the frontage.

10. As a result, I find that the appeal proposals would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the area and would be in accordance with Policy CSP1 of the Newcastle-Under-Lyme and Stoke-on-Trent Core Spatial Strategy 2009 which seeks to protect character and appearance.

11. The proposals would also be consistent with the aims of the Newcastle-Under-Lyme and Stoke-on-Trent Urban Design Guidance Supplementary Planning Document 2010 where it seeks to deliver good design and the National Planning Policy Framework where it seeks to achieve well designed places.

Conditions

12. I have taken into account the Council's request for conditions, which are the standard conditions included with the appeal questionnaire and are fair and reasonable in this instance. These conditions are in the interests of proper planning.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above and taking all other matters into account, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed, and planning permission granted as set out in the formal decision, subject to the conditions included in this decision.

Paul Cooper

INSPECTOR