



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 December 2021

by Helen Smith BSc (Hons) MSc MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: Thursday 6 January 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/M3455/D/21/3284015

33 Sefton Street, Etruria, Stoke-on-Trent ST1 4BQ

- 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 Mrs S Shakoor against the decision of Stoke-on-Trent City Council.
 - The application Ref 66940, dated 7 July 2021, was refused by notice dated 8 September 2021.
 - The development proposed is a single-storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of existing and future occupiers, with regard to amenity space.

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises a terraced dwelling located in an established residential area. The proposal is for a single-storey extension to the rear of 33 Sefton Street.
4. The proposed extension raises concerns with regards to the rear amenity space of the host dwelling. The existing amenity space consists of a walkway leading to a garden gate on rear boundary, and a small yard area set between the rear elevation of No 33's existing rear building and an outside toilet block. The proposal would extend to the rear boundary of No 33; its footprint would remove the small yard area and leave only the walkway as outdoor amenity space. According to the appellant, the amenity space would reduce from 20sqm to 14.6sqm.
5. The loss of the small yard area would harmfully reduce the amenity space for No 33, which is already limited in size. The remaining rear walkway would not be large enough to provide sufficient space for the needs of a family such as bin storage, clothes drying and outdoor seating.
6. I find therefore that the proposed extension would not provide adequate living conditions for the existing and future occupants of the dwelling, having regard to the amount of amenity space.
7. For the reasons given, the proposal would fail to accord with R13 of the Newcastle-under-Lyme and Stoke-on-Trent Urban Design Guidance Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) (adopted 2010), which amongst

other things, seeks to ensure developments provide a good quality of life for residents by adequate provision of amenity space.

8. In addition, the proposal would fail to accord with the National Planning Policy Framework (Para 130) where it seeks to promote health and well-being, and a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

Other Matters

9. I note the claims of the appellant that the proposal would provide additional floorspace and layout that they require and optimise the use of the site. However, for the reasons given the proposal would result in inadequate living conditions. I also note that the appellant considers the proposal to be in keeping with the local character of the area. However, the neighbouring properties in the wider terrace to No 33 do not have existing rear buildings to the scale of the proposal and the existing yard area forms part of the character of the local area.
10. I have determined this appeal on its own individual merits having regard to the particular characteristics of the site and have found no factors that would outweigh the harm I have found.

Conclusion

11. The proposal conflicts with the development plan when considered as a whole and there are no material considerations, either individually or in combination, that would outweigh the identified harm and associated development plan conflict.
12. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Helen Smith

INSPECTOR