The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 November 2018

by F Rafiq BSc (Hons), MCD, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 28th November 2018

Appeal Ref: APP/B3438/D/18/3212214
8 Coalport Close, Cheadle, ST10 1DS

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Mrs S Keates against the decision of Staffordshire Moorlands District Council.
- The application Ref SMD/2018/0333 dated 17 May 2018 was refused by notice dated 10 August 2018.
- The development proposed is a single storey extension to an existing dwelling.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host building and the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two storey detached dwelling, which is situated on Coalport Close. The property faces a public footpath, beyond which is an area of open space. There are a number of similar detached properties which are orientated in this same direction. They are constructed on a consistent building line and have projecting two storey front gables, which give this row of detached dwellings a regular rhythm and cohesive appearance.

4. The proposal seeks a single storey front extension to the dwelling, which would largely infill an area to the side of the two storey front gable. The extension would, however, project past this front element by around 1.3m. I note the group of properties that the appeal site forms part of are defined by a leading gable, which this proposal would project beyond. However, given the single storey form and the limited extent of the projection of the proposal beyond the gable, I do not consider that it would appear obtrusive or unduly disrupt the rhythm of development. From my site observations along the footpath, including from the north, the two storey front projecting gables would remain the dominant feature in the streetscene and I do not find that the projection of the extension past the front of the house would be harmful.

5. The extension proposed would adopt a mono pitch roof and avoids a flat roof form, in line with the *Design Principles* Supplementary Planning Document

(SPD). It would, however, have a noticeably different roof pitch to the main dwelling. The wrapping around of the proposed extensions roof near the eaves level, would also not help assimilate the addition to the existing dwelling and would result in an awkward overlap. Whilst I was able to see that there is variation in the appearance of dwellings in the wider locality, these elements of the roof design would not reflect the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling or the other detached properties along this row. I have taken into account, as the Appellant has stated, that the extension would otherwise have matching eaves details, use complimentary materials, and have a similar front window to that which exists in the current dwelling, but these factors would not outweigh the harm arising from the overall roof design.

6. For the reasons given above, I consider the proposal would cause substantial harm to the character and appearance of the host building and the area. It would conflict with Policy DC1 of the Staffordshire Moorlands Core Strategy (Core Strategy) which seeks, amongst other matters, for all development to be well designed and reinforce local distinctiveness. It would not be the form of sustainable development that Policy SS1a of the Core Strategy or which the National Planning Policy Framework intends there to be a presumption in favour of. It would also be contrary to the SPD, which seeks, amongst other matters, extensions to fit neatly with the existing dwelling.

Other Matters

7. The site is not located in a Conservation Area nor are the properties the appeal site forms part of, protected through listing for their group value. I have, however, found that these buildings do however exhibit a consistent built form, and it is proper to reinforce local distinctiveness as required by Policy DC1 of the Core Strategy.

8. Reference has been made to various properties in the area and what has been referred to as similar extensions or alterations. I have not, however, been made aware of the full circumstances of those cases and note that the Council have set out that the cases referred to as being not comparable. I am required to determine the appeal before me on its own merits, which I have done so accordingly.

9. I note the Appellant has carefully considered the site and wider context in formulating the proposals. A reduction in the size of the proposal would also not provide the accommodation needed by them. These matters would not however, outweigh the substantial harm that would be caused by the development to the character and appearance of the host building and the area.

10. The development would not unacceptably affect the living conditions of neighbouring residents, highway safety or drainage. These are, however, neutral considerations and not benefits of the proposal.

11. My attention has been drawn to permitted development rights, but I have not been made aware of any specific scheme. As referenced by the Appellant, these rights would only allow for a porch extension to the front or other alterations, with greater extensions being possible to the rear.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above and having considered all other matters raised, including reference to pre-application discussions, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

F Rafiq

INSPECTOR