



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 April 2025

by **P Brennan BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 April 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/M3455/D/24/3350690

6 Wren View, Normacot, Stoke-on-Trent ST3 4SZ

- 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 Nahida Bashir against the decision of Stoke-on-Trent City Council.
 - The application Ref is 71121/FUL.
 - The development proposed is a first-floor rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The appellant has identified that 4 and 6 Wren View are occupied by family members. However, as these properties could be split at any time, I have given this consideration limited weight.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the appeal property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The area is predominantly residential in character. The appeal property is a two-storey dwelling situated in a cul-de-sac of two storey properties, three of which are under construction. The design of the property is characterised by its tall front facing gabled roof, as are those at 2 and 4 Wren View. The appeal property has been substantially extended including a roof conversion with a flat roof dormer window to the rear. The two-storey rear wing extension continues the pitched roof design of the main house, whilst the single storey extension beyond has a flat roof. These extensions occupy most of the plot for No 6. In sharing design characteristics with neighbouring dwellings, the appeal property makes an attractive and positive contribution to the character of the area.
5. There is no boundary separation at the rear with the adjoining property of No 4 and the private external space is currently shared between No 4 and No 6. The adjacent dwelling under construction, is set back from the building line of No's 2, 4 and 6 allowing the side elevation of No 6 to be visible from public vantage points in Wren View. As such, the proposed extension would be visible from the turning head of Wren View, although views would be limited due to the position of the adjacent dwelling under construction. Accordingly, I am satisfied that the proposal

would not have a material adverse effect on the character and appearance of the area.

6. Nonetheless, the addition of a first-floor extension above the existing single storey building, would add further significant built form to the rear of the property. The flat roof nature of the development, with a parapet that would sit above the height of the eaves on the adjoining extension and a roof lantern, would be at visual odds with the existing dwelling. This would lead to the proposed development being architecturally incongruous with the appeal property and its neighbours. As such, the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the appeal property.
7. When read in conjunction with the previous extensions, the proposed development would result in a disproportionate form. Despite being to the rear of the appeal property, this would be out of scale to it. This would lead to a loss of visual space within the constrained plot where built form is already extensive, further compromising the remaining external space to the rear.
8. While there were no objections from neighbouring occupiers to the scheme, this is not a reason in itself to allow development which I have found to be visually harmful.
9. Despite having found no material harm to the wider area, for the reasons set out above, the proposed development would have a demonstrable harmful effect on the character and appearance of the appeal property. Accordingly, I find conflict with Policy CSP1 of the Newcastle-Under-Lyme and Stoke-on-Trent Core Spatial Strategy (2006-2026). This policy seeks high quality design that responds to, and integrates with, surrounding buildings, and reinforces local distinctiveness alongside ensuring that the scale, density, and layout of development is appropriate to the site. The proposal would also be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks development that achieves high quality design that contributes positively to local character with regard to its surroundings and context.
10. The proposal would also conflict with guidance within the Newcastle-under-Lyme and Stoke-on-Trent Urban Design Guidance SPD (2010), which highlights specific design considerations for residential extensions. This includes, among other matters, that extensions should either be subordinate to the host dwelling or be a seamless extension to the existing built form.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposal would conflict with the development plan and there are no material considerations that indicate that the development should be determined otherwise than in accordance with it. Therefore, the appeal should be dismissed.

P Brennan

INSPECTOR