



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 February 2022

by Ian McHugh DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4TH March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/D3455/D/21/3286356

31 Osborne Road, Hartshill, Stoke-on-Trent, ST4 7PF

- 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 R Emery against the decision of Stoke-on-Trent City Council.
 - The application Ref 67186, dated 14 September 2021, was refused by notice dated 27 October 2021.
 - The development proposed is a two-storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the streetscene.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two-storey dwelling with an attached single-storey garage. It is situated in a residential area comprising mainly semi-detached dwellings. A number of dwellings in the vicinity of the appeal site have been altered and extended. These alterations include two-storey side extensions. However, notwithstanding these extensions, a particular characteristic is the relatively generous space at first floor level between most of the properties.
4. The proposal is to construct a two-storey extension to provide garaging and utility space on the ground floor with bedroom and study space on the first floor. The front wall of the extension would be flush with the existing front wall of the dwelling and its roof height would match the existing.
5. Policy CSP1 of the Council's adopted Core Spatial Strategy seeks (amongst other things) to ensure that the design of new development is of high quality and contributes positively to the area. In addition, Policy R23 of the Council's Supplementary Planning Document – Urban Design Guidance (SPD) advises that extensions should be well designed and (amongst other things) reflect the pattern and rhythm of the existing built form.
6. I consider that the proposed extension would have an unacceptably harmful and dominant effect on the streetscene, because of its positioning flush with the existing front wall of the dwelling. The resultant mass and narrowing of the gap between properties at first floor level would be at odds with the prevailing character and appearance of the streetscene.

7. In reaching my decision, I have given weight to the appellant's statement that setting the extension back would present difficulties in using the existing foundations, result in a small garage space and would require alteration to services and utilities. However, these matters do not outweigh the harm that I have identified.
8. I have also taken into account the existence of other two storey side extensions on properties on Osborne Road, including the extensions at numbers 19, 23 and 27. I note that the extensions at numbers 19 and 23 have been set-back at first floor level, which gives some relief to their appearance. The extension at number 27 is more comparable with the appeal proposal and I agree with the Council that it is out of character and not something that should be replicated.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above, I consider that the proposal would conflict with the provisions of the Development Plan, the SPD and the Framework, as referred to above. Therefore, it is concluded that the appeal be dismissed.

Ian McHugh

INSPECTOR