



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 April 2024

by A Hartley, LLB(Hons), Solicitor, MBA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13th MAY 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/M3455/D/24/3339024

1 Glencastle Way, Trentham, Stoke-on-Trent, ST4 8QE

- 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 N Hassett against the decision of Stoke on Trent City Council.
 - The application Ref 70282/FUL, dated 5 October 2023, was refused by notice dated 28 November 2023.
 - The proposed development is a two-storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two-storey side extension at 1 Glencastle Way, Trentham, Stoke on Trent, ST4 8QE in accordance with the terms of the application reference 70282/FUL dated 5 October 2023 subject to the following conditions:

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

Refs 2023-2809-07 REV B and 2023-2809-06 REV B

- 2) The materials to be used in the construction of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Procedural Issues

2. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) has been updated since the parties' appeal submissions have been made. However, as the revisions do not affect the matters under consideration in this appeal (other than different paragraph numbering), it was not considered necessary to seek further comment from the parties.

Main Issue

3. The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is within an established residential estate comprising dwellings of similar scale, size, form and design. The appeal building is a modest two-storey semi-detached dwelling on the corner of Glencastle Way and Jonathan Road. It is constructed from facing brickwork under a tile roof. A detached double garage to the rear of the property is accessed from Jonathan Road. There is an open frontage and grassed areas to both Glencastle Way and Jonathan Road.
5. The proposal would introduce a two-storey extension to the side elevation that would provide additional living space. It would not protrude further toward Jonathan Road than the existing double garage. The remaining grassed area would retain a sense of openness between Jonathan Road and the built development, which is a recognised feature of corner plots in the surrounding area. Due to the relationship of the existing double garage to Jonathan Road there is no recognised rhythm of built development along Jonathan Road that would be disrupted by the proposal.
6. The design of the proposal insets the extension from the host dwelling front elevation and the proposed ridge height is lower than the host dwelling. Therefore, despite it being relatively wide as a proportion of the existing house this creates a subservient extension of good design, subject to the use of materials to match the host dwelling, which could be controlled by condition.
7. The dwelling is semi-detached, and thus the introduction of a side extension inevitably impacts on the existing symmetry. However, the symmetry of dwellings along Glencastle Way has to some extent already been disrupted by the introduction of extensions. Further, due to the corner position at the end of Glencastle Way, any disruption to rhythm and symmetry is lessened.
8. Overall, I find that the proposal would not materially harm the character and appearance of the building or the surrounding area. Consequently, I find that the proposal complies with CSP1 of the Newcastle under Lyme and Stoke on Trent Core Spatial Strategy (2009), Policy R23 of the Newcastle under Lyme and Stoke on Trent Urban Design Guide, and paragraph 135 of the Framework in terms of the positive impact of its design on the building and the character of the surrounding area.

Conditions

9. I have had regard to the conditions suggested by the Council. I have imposed a condition specifying the approved plans as this provides certainty. In the interests of the visual amenity of the area I have imposed a condition regarding materials.

Conclusion

10. Having taken into account all representations made, for the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed subject to conditions.

A Hartley

INSPECTOR