

**APPEAL BY MR BEN SPRINGETT AGAINST THE DECISION OF THE COUNCIL TO REFUSE PLANNING PERMISSION FOR A TWO STOREY SIDE EXTENSION, PART TWO STOREY AND PART SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSIONS**

<b><u>Application Number</u></b>	<b>19/00136/FUL</b>
<b><u>LPA's Decision</u></b>	<b>Refused under delegated powers</b>
<b><u>Appeal Decision</u></b>	<b>Dismissed</b>
<b><u>Date of Appeal Decision</u></b>	<b>9<sup>th</sup> October 2019</b>

The Inspector identified the main issue to be the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area

In dismissing the appeal the Inspector made the following key comments and observations:-

- The appeal site is within a predominantly residential area characterised by semi-detached houses. The property forms a pair of semi-detached dwellings of similar appearance in width, characterised with identical features including hipped roofs. Despite some variation in form, the properties in the area present a discreet arrangement that appreciably contributes towards the local character.
- The width of the proposed two storey extension to the side would be excessive as it would be almost the same with as the existing dwelling itself, even though it would be set back slightly from the front of the property and sit below the main roof of the house. The length would also project some considerable distance to the rear and wrap around creating a further imposing large two storey addition on the rear elevation. The sheer scale of the side and rear elevations would not appear subservient to the host dwelling. This would result in a detrimental impact to its character and appearance.
- The location of the property along the road would result in the side extension being clearly visible in the street scene, particularly due to the open aspect of the frontage with the driveway. When this is combined with its overall scale, substantial width, minimal setback and excessive length of the roof ridge across the host property it would create an unbalanced and negative appearance to these symmetrical properties. This would detract from the character and appearance of both properties and the street scene
- There is sufficient distance between the proposed development and boundary of No. 59 and as such there would be no terracing effect, but this does not outweigh the other harm identified.
- The proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property and the area. Therefore it would be contrary to Policy H18 of the Local Plan, Policy CSP1 of the Core Spatial Strategy and would also be at odds with the guidance R23 in the Supplementary Planning Document, Newcastle-under-Lyme and Stoke-on-Trent Urban Design Guidance.
- The appeal should be dismissed.

**Recommendation**

That the appeal decision be noted.