



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 February 2023

by N Duff BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 09 March 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/M3455/D/22/3310665

44 Emerson Road, Cobridge, Stoke-on-Trent ST6 3JJ

- 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 N Bibi against the decision of Stoke-on-Trent City Council.
 - The application Ref 68072, dated 17 May 2022, was refused by notice dated 17 August 2022.
 - The development proposed is Front porch extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. Emerson Road is a quiet predominantly residential road within a housing estate, characterised by semi detached and terraced properties, with large front gardens. The frontages of the properties along this side of Emerson Road are generally consistent in pattern and built form.
4. Number 44 Emerson Road is an end of terrace property. The terrace is set back from neighbouring terraces either side. The property has been previously extended in the form of a side extension, which has a secondary front door. The property and its adjoining neighbour have an addition of a canopy over the original front door, however none of the properties within the host terrace or terraces either side have had substantial extensions to the front elevations. This is generally consistent with other development in the immediate vicinity.
5. The front porch would extend along the full width of the property incorporating the existing two storey side extension. The proposal would dominate the front elevation of the property would and be out of keeping with other dwellings in the terrace. The proposed porch would ensure that the property only has one front door which would make the dwelling appear clearly as one dwelling, however the existing situation with two entrance points on the front elevation is not considered to be harmful. The porch would not be forward of the general building line along Emerson Road, however the extent of the porch and the inconsistency with neighbouring properties would be incongruous and harmful to the character of the area.

6. For these reasons I conclude that the front porch would have a negative effect on the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore fail to accord with Policy CSP1 of the Newcastle-under-Lyme and Stoke-on-Trent Core Spatial Strategy (CSS) 2006-2026 (Adopted October 2009), which seeks to ensure that new development contributes positively to an area's identity.
7. The proposal does not accord with the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) having regard to paragraph 130 which requires developments to be sympathetic to local character. Further, the proposal does not accord with the guidance contained in part C1 of the National Design Guide (NDG), which states that well designed development responds positively to the features of the site itself and surrounding context beyond the site boundary.
8. Having regard to the Newcastle-under-Lyme and Stoke-on-Trent Urban Design Guidance Supplementary Planning Document December 2010 (SPD), Policy R23 states that extensions to dwellings should be well designed and contribute positively to the townscape character. For the reasons mentioned, this proposal is contrary to the guidance contained within the SPD.

Other Matters

9. The Appellant's evidence refers to the living arrangements of the occupiers and the proposed porch would improve internal circulation between the two separate areas of the dwelling. However, it is unclear whether there are alternative means to improve circulation within the dwelling. Whilst I accept that this would provide a practical internal space to access the areas of the dwelling, this matter does not outweigh the harm identified in the main issue.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the front porch extension would not accord with Policy CSP1 of the CSS. Although the proposal does not conflict with other policies of the development plan, this leads me to conclude that the proposal conflicts with the development plan as a whole. It also does not accord with Policy R23 of the SPD, part C1 of the NDG and the Framework. Thus, having had regard to all other matters raised the appeal is dismissed.

N Duff

INSPECTOR