



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 July 2025

by **Sarah Colebourne MA, MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/M3455/D/25/3366657

2 Ambrose Place, Packmoor, Stoke-on-Trent, ST6 6XB

- 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 and Mrs Butler against the decision of Stoke-on-Trent City Council.
 - The application Ref is 71808.
 - The development proposed is a single storey side extension and alterations to rear garden room.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises a detached two storey house located on a corner plot within a modern housing estate. The dwelling sits on elevated land with a good-sized area of open, lawned garden to its side on ground that slopes away from the side elevation and faces the junction of Ambrose Place and Overwood Road. That land provides a sense of openness and greenery in the street scene here where dwellings are generally sited close together with only small gaps between them and as such it contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area. The corner position and elevated land give the dwelling a high degree of prominence in the street scene.
4. The proposed single storey extension would be sited on the gable end of that side elevation and would occupy its entire length of some 9.3m, aligning with the main front and rear walls of the dwelling and extending to the side by some 3.3m. It would have a single-pitched, lean-to roof.
5. As the ground drops away significantly from the side of the dwelling, the side elevation of the proposed extension would have a greater mass of brickwork than would normally be the case on a more level site. This, together with the lack of any setback from the front and rear elevations and its prominent corner siting, would result in an unduly dominant addition. This would be exacerbated by the proposed lean-to roof that would fail to reflect the design of the main dual-pitched roof. Even if the proposal had included landscaping or a condition attached as suggested in the appellants' statement, this would not sufficiently mitigate the impact of this

extension. As such, by reason of its siting, scale and design, the proposal would significantly harm the character and appearance of the dwelling and the area.

6. The other examples of side extensions elsewhere on the estate referred to by the appellants are not directly comparable, because the topography of those sites is very different from here.
7. I find then that the proposed development would be contrary to development plan policy CSP1 of the Newcastle-under-Lyme and Stoke-on-Trent Core Spatial Strategy 2006-2026 (adopted 2009) which requires that new development makes a positive contribution in terms of its design quality.
8. I have noted the personal circumstances of the appellants and their family, and that the proposal would provide extra accommodation for a family member with additional needs. However, even if I had more compelling evidence of the need for that accommodation, I have not been persuaded that there is no other means of providing it in a more appropriate manner, either through an alternative layout of the existing accommodation or a more appropriately sited, scaled and designed extension. That matter does not, therefore, outweigh the harm I have identified and the conflict with the development plan.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposal would be contrary to the development plan and there are no material considerations that would outweigh that. The appeal should be dismissed.

Sarah Colebourne

INSPECTOR