

APPEAL BY MR AND MRS DANIEL MULLINEUX AGAINST THE DECISION OF THE COUNCIL TO REFUSE PLANNING PERMISSION FOR A SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION AND FIRST FLOOR EXTENSION AT 57, BERESFORD CRESCENT, WESTLANDS, NEWCASTLE-UNDER-LYME.

<u>Application Number</u>	17/00020/FUL
<u>LPA's Decision</u>	Refused under delegated powers 13th March 2017
<u>Appeal Decision</u>	Part allowed / part dismissed
<u>Date of Appeal Decision</u>	20th June 2017

The Inspector considered the main issue to be the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene.

The Inspector made the following comments:

- The appeal relates to one half of a pair of semi-detached dwellings that is elevated above Beresford Crescent.
- The proposed first floor side extension would be sited above an existing side extension and to the rear of an existing two storey side extension. The roof of this extension would be altered to tie into the main ridge of No.57.
- This would create a bulkier side extension with a larger roof form which would not respect the design, scale and form of the host dwelling. In addition, the proposal would create a discordant and dominant feature due to its increased ridge length and roof form, which would detract materially from the character of the original dwelling.
- The additional roof mass would also harm the symmetry and balance of the pair of semi-detached dwellings and given their slightly elevated position above the road, it would be prominent emphasising the detrimental effect of the extension on the integrity of the original design of the group of dwellings on this part of Beresford Crescent. Thus it would not respect the character and appearance of the street scene.
- Although the appellant has referred to examples of other extensions in the surrounding area, the Inspector considered that the presence of other extensions in the area do not outweigh the harmful effect that the proposed side extension would have on the appeal dwelling, the pair of dwellings and the street scene. In any case, each case must be determined on its own merits in the light of current planning policy.
- The proposed single storey rear extension would be acceptable and as that element is separate in nature, planning permission can be granted as part of a split decision.
- However, the proposed first floor extension conflicts with policies in the Development Plan and the Framework and the appeal in relation to this part of the proposal therefore fails.
- The appeal should be allowed in part and dismissed in part.

Your Officer's Comments

That the decision be noted.