The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 August 2019

by R Morgan MCD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 September 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/B3438/D/19/3230063
6 Nevin Avenue, Knypersley, Stoke-on-Trent ST8 7BP

- 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 Mr Mark Vause against the decision of Staffordshire Moorlands District Council.
- The application Ref SMD/2019/0110, dated 21 February 2019, was refused by notice dated 9 May 2019.
- The development proposed is demolition of rear conservatory, replacement with single storey extension and raising of roof to create first floor level.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the demolition of a rear conservatory, replacement with a single storey extension and raising of roof to create a first floor level at 6 Nevin Avenue, Knypersely, Stoke-on-Trent ST8 7BP in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref SMD/2019/0110, dated 21 February 2019, subject to the following conditions:

    1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.

    2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 1872/01 rev A, 1872/02 rev A.

    3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal property is located within a residential area of Knypersley. Nevin Avenue is one of a number of streets characterised by bungalows of a similar style, set back from the road behind front gardens with pitched roofs and projecting gables at the front and rear.

4. The proposed development would raise the height of the roof of No 6 and add rear dormers to create a new first floor level. The existing front roof pitch would be continued to create a new ridge, set further back and approximately 0.6m higher than the position of the existing ridge.

5. The roofs and front elevations of the bungalows in this area have generally not been significantly altered from their original design, so although windows and doors have been changed the houses have a relatively uniform feel. Having said that, there are examples in the area where dormers have been added and other alterations made. The appellants have identified the example of 7 Menai Drive where the roof height has been raised and front dormers added.

6. I agree with the Council that in general, raising the height of the roofs of bungalows in this area could have an unacceptable effect on the character of the area, particularly where the buildings are set in more uniform rows along the streets. However, in this case the property is located at the head of a cul-de-sac, forming one of a group of bungalows set around the turning circle. The positioning of the houses relative to each other at the head of Nevin Avenue means that the common ridge height is not obvious when viewed from the road, such that it has a limited influence on the streetscene.

7. No 6 is positioned at an angle to No 8, with a relatively large gap at the side of the two properties. This means that the modest proposed increase in the height of No 6 would not look prominent when viewed alongside No 8. Whilst No 6 and No 4 are positioned in a straight line relative to each other and are viewed as a pair, No 6 is slightly set back from No 4 which would reduce any effect of the increased ridge height when viewed from the street. The effect would be further reduced by the new position of the ridge. Nos 6 and 4 are also viewed in the context of No 2 which has previously been extended. The alterations to No 2 have resulted in a change in the angle of the pitch, so that the roof is shallower at the bottom section and steeper at the top. Whilst this does not appear to have raised the overall roof height it has nonetheless changed the appearance of the roof quite significantly, reducing the common appearance of the properties in this part of the cul-de-sac.

8. Due to the factors identified above, the proposed increase in the ridge height at No 6 could be satisfactorily accommodated within the street scene. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. As such it accords with Policies SS1 and SS1a of the Staffordshire Moorlands Core Strategy 2014 which set out development principles for the area and the presumption in favour of sustainable development; Policy SS5b which sets out more detailed policy objectives for Biddulph; the design considerations in Policy DC1 and the Design Principles SPD, and the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework, including section 12 which is concerned with achieving high quality design.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons set out above the appeal should succeed. Planning permission is granted subject to conditions that are necessary in the interests of certainty and safeguarding the character and appearance of the area.

Rosie Morgan

INSPECTOR