

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 September 2024

by N McGurk BSc (Hons) MCD MBA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 September 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/M3455/D/24/3348105

2 Cleveland Road, Shelton, Stoke-on-Trent, ST1 4DX

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mrs Nussrat Rasool against the decision of Stoke-on-Trent City Council.
 - The application Ref is 70842.
 - The development proposed is a part two storey part first floor level side extension (resubmission of 70220/FUL).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The appellant states that the proposal the subject of this appeal addresses the reason for the refusal of a previous planning application¹.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal property is an end of terrace two storey dwelling, with single storey extensions to the side and rear. It is located within a residential area largely characterised by the presence of two and three storey terraced and semi-detached dwellings.
5. The appeal property is situated in a very prominent position, at Cleveland Road's junction with Shirley Road and opposite its junction with The Parkway. The property also sits opposite a main entrance to Hanley Park.
6. Like other dwellings in the area, the appeal dwelling is set only a very short distance back from the road, behind a low wall and narrow paved area.
7. The proposal would involve a two storey and first floor extensions to the side. I recognise that the proposal would be set down from the ridge of the host

¹ Reference: 56783/FUL.

dwelling's roof and that it would be set back from the original front elevation. However, it would still comprise a very wide and tall development.

8. The proposal would significantly extend the width of the host dwelling's two storey element and the visual impact of this would be increased as a result of what would appear as an unduly elongated roof design.
9. I find that, as a consequence of the above, the proposal would not appear subservient. Rather, the proposal's overall scale and bulk would result in it appearing to visually dominate, to the extent of overwhelming, the appearance of the host property. The proposal would detract from rather than contribute positively to, the appearance of the host property, as well as that of the terrace and the surrounding area.
10. The harm arising from this would be exacerbated as a result of the prominent location of the appeal property, such that the harmful impacts of the proposal would be widely visible.
11. Taking all of this into account, I find that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area, contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework and to Newcastle-under-Lyme and Stoke-on-Trent Core Spatial Strategy (2009) Policy CSP1, which together amongst other things, seek to protect local character.

Other Matters

12. In support of her case, the appellant refers to other developments within the wider vicinity. However, none of these comprise developments and circumstances so similar to the proposal before me as to provide for direct comparison and in any case, I have found that the proposal would result in significant harm and this is not something that is mitigated by the presence of other developments elsewhere.
13. Whilst I am sympathetic to the appellant's wish to provide for additional family accommodation, as set out above I have found that the proposal would result in significant harm and this is not a matter that is outweighed by the appellant's personal circumstances in this regard.

Conclusion

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

N McGurk

INSPECTOR