



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 July 2023

by D Cleary MTCP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4 September 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/M3455/D/23/3322271

4 Chadwell Way, Bentilee, Stoke-on-Trent ST2 0LG

- 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 Valentin Dinca against the decision of the City of Stoke-on-Trent Council.
 - The application Ref: 68880, dated 13 February 2023, was refused by notice dated 17 May 2023.
 - The development proposed is described as the 'isolation for a semidetached property with polystyrene panels 50 mm thickness reinforced with fiberglass mesh and rendering with ceresit zu isolation render + acrylic render (magnolia colour)'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. I have amended the address from that which is within the application form to remove repetition.
3. The description of development in the banner above has been taken from the planning application form. However, in Part E of the appeal form it is stated that the description of development has not changed but, nevertheless, a different wording has been entered. Neither of the main parties has provided written confirmation that a revised description of development has been agreed. Accordingly, I have used the one given on the original application which I consider to be sufficiently accurate.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons

5. The surrounding area is predominantly characterised by two storey semi-detached dwellings of similar scale and form. The housing estate is of post-war construction comprising long linear streets that are inter-connected by shorter streets, with pockets of open space interspersed throughout the estate. The predominant facing materials within the housing estate is red brick and tile. The estate has a general uniformity in the form and materials and this contributes towards its character.

6. The appeal dwelling, and its semi-detached pairing, are located on a corner plot positioned behind a small green at the junction of Winchester Avenue and Chadwell Way. The dwellings are angled so that they address the open space and junction. The front elevation is prominent within the street, particularly from Winchester Avenue, while the side elevation is exposed to views from Chadwell Way due to the orientation of the dwelling. The use of red brick and tile are the predominant facing materials in this part of the estate.
7. The proposal seeks to render the front, side and rear elevations of the dwelling in a magnolia colour. The rendering of the dwelling would introduce a material and colour finish that would be in a stark contrast to the traditional red brick material of the dwelling and area. Furthermore, the render would visually imbalance the semi-detached pairing and appear markedly at odds with the surrounding dwellings. The proposal would therefore disrupt the established uniformity and consistency of the streetscene, which would be exacerbated by the prominent position that the appeal dwelling occupies.
8. I have had regard to the various examples of alterations to dwellings within the wider estate which have been cited by the appellant. These dwellings have been altered with render and/or stonework. Many of these dwellings are less prominent compared to the appeal dwelling. Some relate to much smaller alterations and lesser coverage of the front elevation. While others altered dwellings are seen in the context with other altered elevations. Furthermore, I do not have any details of the lawfulness of any of these alterations. Therefore, I do not find these examples to be directly comparable to the appeal scheme which, in any event, I have determined on its merits.
9. I conclude that the proposed development would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and surrounding area. Therefore, the development conflicts with Policy CSP1 of the Newcastle-under-Lyme and Stoke-on-Trent Core Spatial Strategy 2006-2026 (2009), the Urban Design Guidance Supplementary Planning Document (2010), The National Design Guide (2019), and the National Planning Policy Framework (2021). Together, amongst other things, these require development to be of high-quality design.

Other Matters

10. It is acknowledged that the proposed works would bring benefits through improving the energy efficiency of the property. However, such benefits would be limited to a single property and would not outweigh the harm that I have identified.

Conclusion

11. For the above reasons the appeal is dismissed.

D Cleary

INSPECTOR