



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 January 2025

by **N McGurk BSc (Hons) MCD MBA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 January 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/M3455/D/24/3354892

86 Buccleuch Road, Stoke-on-Trent, ST3 4RL

- 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 Mr Famid Hussain against the decision of Stoke-on-Trent City Council.
 - The application Ref is 71054.
 - The development proposed is erection of new single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The planning application the subject of this appeal was supported by a single plan¹. This plan relates to Number 78 Buccleuch Road and shows the proposed development in the context of Number 80 Buccleuch Road. The plan does not relate to the appeal property.
3. The appellant subsequently submitted a revised plan² relating to the application address.
4. However, this revised plan shows an existing form of development that would appear to suggest that the development the subject of the revised plan has been completed.
5. This would be contrary to the application form, which states that the proposed development has neither commenced nor been completed.
6. During my site visit, I observed that a form of development has taken place at the appeal site. However, the development in situ appears unfinished.
7. In addition to all of the above, the revised plan appears to set out a proposal which does not appear to relate to the detailed information provided on the application form.
8. Given all of this, I am unable to reconcile the planning application, the revised plan and the situation on the ground.

¹ Reference: 20240102-01, dated 10/06/2024.

² Reference: 20240102-01 REVISION A, dated 30/09/24.

9. The original plan did not relate to the appeal site. The revised plan does not relate to the application form. Whilst a form of development appears to have commenced at the appeal site, the application form states that this is not the case.
10. Taking all of this into account, I do not have sufficient accurate information before me to consider the effects of the proposed development – whatever that might be - and consequently, I cannot reach any other conclusion than that set out below.

Conclusion

11. The appeal does not succeed.

N McGurk

INSPECTOR