

**APPEAL BY MRS P DALEY AGAINST THE DECISION OF THE BOROUGH COUNCIL TO REFUSE THE GRANT OF PLANNING PERMISSION FOR A TWO STOREY SIDE AND SINGLE STOREY FRONT EXTENSION AT 134 CHATTERLEY DRIVE, KIDSGROVE**

<b><u>Application Number</u></b>	<b>16/00241/FUL</b>
<b><u>LPA's Decision</u></b>	<b>Refused by delegated powers on 10<sup>th</sup> June 2016</b>
<b><u>Appeal Decision</u></b>	<b>Appeal dismissed</b>
<b><u>Date of Appeal Decision</u></b>	<b>3<sup>rd</sup> November 2016</b>

The Inspector considered the main issue to be the effect of the proposed extensions on the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area.

In dismissing the appeal the Inspector made the following key points:

- As the building is set behind the adjoining building line the works would not be prominently visible on the approach from the south. Nevertheless, in views on the approach from the north, and from the front of the building, the excessive width of the proposal, which would almost double the width of the original dwelling, would unbalance the appearance of the pair. This effect would be exacerbated by the proposed alterations to fenestration which would increase the proportion of brickwork in relation to windows on the front elevation in stark contrast with that on the adjoining dwelling. These changes, taken together, would radically alter the appearance of the host property to the extent that it would appear incongruous and fail to assimilate comfortably in the streetscene.
- It was noted that in the wider area there is some variation in appearance of dwellings and that other properties have been extended. However, alterations are generally proportionate in form and do not detract from the wider streetscene. In contrast, due to its scale and form the proposal would have an intrusive and discordant appearance which would be harmful to both the appearance of the host dwelling, and the character of the area. Therefore, whilst the Council may have approved larger extensions elsewhere in the Borough, such instances do not justify the harm that would arise in this case.
- The proposal would fail to comply with Policy H18 of the Newcastle under Lyme Local Plan and Policy CSP1 of the Newcastle under Lyme and Stoke on Trent Core Spatial Strategy which together seek to ensure that the design of extensions contributes positively to the character of the original dwelling and surrounding area. It would also conflict with guidance within the National Planning Policy Framework which advises that permission should be refused for development of poor design, which fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area.
- Whilst the Inspector had some sympathy for the applicant's requirement for family accommodation, it was not considered that the harm that would arise from an extension of the form proposed would be outweighed by this benefit in this case.

**Recommendation**

**That the decision be noted.**