



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 July 2022

by N McGurk BSc (Hons) MCD MBA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 August 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/M3455/D/22/3299460

892 High Lane, Burslem, Stoke-on-Trent, ST6 6HE

- 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 Omer Munir against the decision of Stoke-on-Trent City Council.
 - The application Ref 67529, dated 31 December 2021, was refused by notice dated 22 March 2022.
 - The development proposed is a first floor rear and part side extension including internal reconfiguration.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two storey semi-detached dwelling. It is located in a residential area and occupies a prominent location, fronting High Lane at its junction with Clement Road.
 4. During my site visit, I observed this part of High Lane to be a busy road in a residential area. Whilst most dwellings in the area tend to comprise brick-built semi-detached dwellings, there is a two storey residential care home on the opposite side of High Lane to the appeal property and a dormer bungalow on the opposite side of Clement Road, Number 894 High Lane.
 5. Houses tend to be set back from the road behind parking areas and/or gardens and have long gardens to the rear. This and the presence of grass verges, street trees, low boundary walls and hedgerows, affords a green and spacious quality to the area.
 6. The area where Clement Road runs alongside the host property is notably open and spacious. No. 894 is low in height and has a wide and long garden to the side and whilst its boundary wall alongside Clement Road is tall, it is still considerably lower than the height of the appeal property's rear extension, opposite.
-

7. Further Clement Road slopes downhill, away from High Lane. Thus, whilst there is a significant sense of openness as one enters Clement Road from High Lane, the appeal property appears as a dominant and prominent built feature as one moves along Clement Road from the bottom of the hill towards High Lane.
8. I also noted during my site visit that, whilst many dwellings have been altered and/or extended, such changes generally appear in keeping with host properties and as a consequence, there is a noticeable similarity and sense of rhythm in runs of houses, lending the character of the area an attractive sense of uniformity.
9. The appeal property is of brick and tile construction and shares a hipped roof with the adjoining dwelling, Number 890 High Lane. The property has been extended to the rear. This comprises a large single storey extension, of matching materials to the host property and also with a hipped roof. The extension also extends out to the side of the rear of the host property, well-beyond the build-line of the original dwelling's side elevation.
10. Thus, whilst it does adjoin the rear of the original dwelling, partly due to its separate hipped roof and off-set position, to some considerable degree, the existing rear extension appears from some angles as something of a separate entity to the host property.
11. The proposal would result in the significant enlargement of the rear extension to create a two storey building with a hipped roof. Rather than appear as a seamless addition to the host property, the proposal would, to a considerable extent, appear as a partly disconnected building.
12. The visual impact of this would be increased as a result of the overall scale of the proposal, such that the resultant development would not appear subordinate to the host property but would, in effect, appear as a building of similar scale constructed immediately adjacent to the host property. This would create an unduly awkward relationship as each element of the overall dwelling would appear to compete for primacy.
13. Consequently, the proposal would appear as an unduly large addition and I find that it would appear overbearing, especially when seen from Clement Road, the lower parts of which it would visually dominate. It would also appear incongruous in an area where other extensions appear in keeping with host properties and maintain the area's sense of uniformity.
14. The harm arising from the above would be exacerbated as a result of the prominent location of the appeal property whereby the proposal would draw attention to itself as an incongruous feature.
15. Taking all of the above into account, I find that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the area, contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework; to Newcastle-under-Lyme and Stoke-on-Trent Core Spatial Strategy (2010) Policy CSP1 and to the Council's Urban Design Guidance Supplementary Planning Document (2010), which together amongst other things, seek to protect local character.

Other Matters

16. In support of his case, the appellant draws attention to other developments elsewhere in the vicinity. Whilst I note these, there is no evidence to demonstrate that any are so similar to that proposed as to provide for direct comparison. Notwithstanding this, the proposal the subject of this appeal would result in harm and this is not a factor mitigated by the presence of other developments elsewhere.

Conclusion

17. For the reasons given above, the appeal does not succeed.

N McGurk

INSPECTOR