

Classification: NULBC **UNCLASSIFIED**

APPEAL BY MR MYLES OAKES AGAINST THE DECISION OF THE COUNCIL TO REFUSE PLANNING PERMISSION FOR THE CREATION OF A FULL-LENGTH, DOUBLE ROOM TIMBER DORMER EXTENSION OVER THE EXISTING GARAGE AND ALTERATIONS AT 11 GREENOCK CLOSE, NEWCASTLE-UNDER-LYME

Application Number 21/00643/FUL

LPA's Decision Refused on 17th August 2021 under delegated authority

Appeal Decision Dismissed

Date of Decision 3rd February 2022

Appeal Decision

The Inspector identified the main issues to be the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the dwelling and the street scene and whether the personal circumstances of the appellant would outweigh any harm in respect of the proposed development.

Character and appearance

The Inspector considered that due to its scale and box-like form, the proposed dormer extension would appear distinctly at odds with the simple form of the host dwelling and would not appear as part of the original dwelling. Nor would it appear as a seamless extension or be clearly subservient to the host dwelling. The Inspector also noted that a dormer of this scale with large, monotonous areas of cladding, in a highly visible corner location, would result in a dominant and incongruous feature in the street scene.

The Inspector concluded that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the dwelling and its discordant appearance would harm the appearance of the street scene. Consequently, the proposal would be contrary to Policy H18 of the Newcastle-under-Lyme Local Plan 2011, Policy CSP1 of the Newcastle-under-Lyme and Stoke-on-Trent Core Spatial Strategy 2006-2026, the guidance in the SPD and the design policies of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Personal circumstances

The Inspector recognised that the proposed extension would create a larger and more adaptable living area to meet the needs of the appellant, whose health conditions significantly affect their day-to-day life and are likely to continue in perpetuity. It was noted that if planning permission were to be refused, the appellant might continue to live in a property with very few facilities, which would not be good for their health and would result in harm to someone with a protected characteristic.

However it was concluded that there is very limited evidence of alternative schemes considered and their relative costs. The Inspector could therefore not be certain that the accommodation required cannot be achieved in another way which does not result in the same harm to the character and appearance of the dwelling or the streetscene.

For these reasons the appeal was dismissed

The planning decision setting out the reasons for refusal and the appeal decision in full can be viewed via the following link;

<http://publicaccess.newcastle-staffs.gov.uk/online-applications/PLAN/21/00643/FUL>

Recommendation

That the appeal decision be noted.

Classification: NULBC **UNCLASSIFIED**

Classification: NULBC **UNCLASSIFIED**

Classification: NULBC **UNCLASSIFIED**