



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 October 2021

by K Stephens BSc (Hons) MTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2nd November 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/M3455/D/21/3276940

2 Crossdale Avenue, Baddeley Green, Stoke-on-Trent ST2 7JB

- 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 A Hughes against the decision of Stoke-on-Trent Council.
 - The application Ref 66161, dated 22 December 2020, was refused by notice dated 5 May 2021.
 - The development proposed is a single storey front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey front extension at 2 Crossdale Avenue, Baddeley Green, Stoke-on-Trent ST2 7JB in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 66161 dated 22 December 2020, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be begun within three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved drawing 20-AH-02 Rev A.
 - 3) The materials to be used for the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the construction of the existing building.

Application for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Mr A Hughes against Stoke-on-Trent Council. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a detached bungalow located in a predominantly residential area characterised by a mix of bungalows and two-storey dwellings. Whilst there is some overall uniformity to the area in that properties front towards, but are set back from, the road, there is a mix of house types and some variety of detailing. I saw that a number of properties in the area have been extended, including at the front or to side elevations that face a road. The appeal property is prominently located on an open corner with Trentfields Road and the cul-de-sac Crossdale Avenue. The properties opposite on Trentfields

Road are detached dwellings and Crossdale Avenue comprises mostly semi-detached bungalows arranged on a staggered building line. However, the appeal property and the one on the facing corner are the only detached bungalows in Crossdale Avenue and both have gable frontages. Hence they do not share the same uniformity of design as the rest of Crossdale Avenue.

5. The proposed extension would provide a dining area to the kitchen. It would project out from the front elevation of the property by approximately 2 metres and be about 3.2 metres wide across the front. I do not have plans before me, but I am led to understand the proposed extension would not project out as far as the front extension approved by the Council at 10 Crossdale Avenue, which is located towards the far end of the cul-de-sac.
6. The pitched roof of the extension would match the shape and pitch of the roof of the host dwelling and would be set much lower down so as to appear subservient. The eaves would be aligned with the existing eaves line, and the design detailing would include barge boards and brickwork to match the host dwelling. As a result, I find the extension would be modest in size and its design would complement the host dwelling.
7. The location of the extension farthest away from the corner with Trentfields Road, the staggered building line of Crossdale Avenue and the detached nature of the property combine to ensure that the proposed extension would not be an unduly intrusive addition to Crossdale Avenue or to the street scene of Trentfields Road. On my visit I saw that the proposed extension would not be dissimilar to other pitched roof front extensions that have been added to other bungalows in the vicinity, particularly along Hamilton Rise. Consequently, the design and format of the proposed extension would not be an incongruous feature in the surrounding area.
8. I find the proposed extension would not significantly diminish or harm the character and appearance of the property or the surrounding area. Accordingly I find no conflict with the Core Strategy¹ Policy CSP1, which seeks to ensure new development is well designed to respect the character of the area and contribute positively. It would also accord with design guidance for extensions in the Council's Supplementary Planning Document "Urban Design Guidance".
9. I do not consider that allowing the appeal would set a precedent as it would not stop the Council from dealing with other proposals on their individual merits, as is evident from the various approved extensions I have been directed to look at.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should succeed and planning permission should be granted, subject to conditions that are necessary in the interests of certainty and safeguarding the character and appearance of the area.

K. Stephens
INSPECTOR

¹ Newcastle-under-Lyme and Stoke-on-Trent Core Spatial Strategy 2006-2026, adopted October 2009