



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 October 2015

by **P Eggleton BSc(Hons) MRTPI**

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

Decision date: **28/10/2015**

Appeal Ref: APP/W0734/D/15/3081115

8 Moor Park, Middlesbrough, Cleveland TS7 0JJ

- 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 and Mrs Quinn against the decision of Middlesbrough Council.
 - The application Ref M/FP/0279/15/P, dated 10 March 2015, was refused by notice dated 7 May 2015.
 - The development proposed is a part single and part two storey extension to side and rear; and a new pitched roof to replace flat roof over existing single storey element to rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a part single and part two storey extension to side and rear; and a new pitched roof to replace flat roof over existing single storey element to rear at 8 Moor Park, Middlesbrough, Cleveland in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref M/FP/0279/15/P, dated 10 March 2015, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Proposed Block Plan, Drawing 15105-01 (showing the proposed floor plans) and Drawing 15105-01 (showing the proposed elevations).
 - 3) The materials used in the construction of the external surfaces of the works hereby permitted shall match those of the existing dwelling.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The proposal would result in a two storey side extension and a pitched roof over the single storey flat roof to the rear. Concerns have not been raised with regard to the works to the rear and the new roof would be an improvement.
 4. The property is one of a row of five, two storey dwellings that were built with a single storey garage to the side. This arrangement results in gaps between the
-

- first floor elements of the dwellings. The planning authority and the Parish Council are concerned that the proposed extension and the loss of much of this gap would result in the dwelling having an overbearing appearance that would be out of keeping with the character of the area.
5. The dwelling has previously been extended and now has a substantial feature gable to the front which adds interest and provides some articulation to the design. The proposed side addition would mirror, to a large extent, the existing appearance of the dwelling to the other side of the gable. The gable extends forward of the original building line and would become a central and prominent feature of the design.
 6. The proposal would significantly close the gap between this and the neighbouring property at first floor level. The position of the property on the junction results in it being relatively prominent but I did not find the uniform gaps to be clearly apparent in longer views, given the existence of mature trees and the screening effect of other dwellings. The area includes a range of house types and designs with many detached houses in very close proximity to each other. Others have been extended, leaving very little space between dwellings. The wider area is not therefore characterised by housing in spacious settings. I am not persuaded that the reduction in the gap between these properties would materially alter the character of this area or detract from the setting or appearance of these houses.
 7. I find that the proposed design would be of a good standard and would result in the property having a satisfactory appearance. A gap would be retained between this and the neighbouring property which would prevent a terracing effect occurring. Overall, I consider that the proposal has been well thought out. It would not conflict with Policy DC1(b) of the Core Strategy 2008 which requires that account be taken of the visual appearance and layout of the area. It would also satisfy Policy CS5(c) as this seeks to secure a high standard of design and the integration of development with the immediate and wider context. These policies generally accord with the design requirements of the *National Planning Policy Framework* and I afford them considerable weight.
 8. Policy D5 of the Nunthorpe Design Statement Supplementary Planning Document 2011 advises that extensions can have a considerable effect and should reflect the scale, detailing and materials of the parent building. It requires that extra care be taken with side extensions that can be seen from the highway. It also suggests a staggering of extensions to avoid lineation or a terracing effect and to ensure that it remains sub-servient to the host property. Given the prominent central gable which extends forward of the existing first floor elements, the first floor addition would appear as being set back and secondary to the main design feature. I am satisfied that the final composition would achieve a high standard of design and would not therefore conflict with the objectives of the guidance.
 9. I have considered all the matters put forward by the planning authority and the Parish Council but given the nature of the character of this area and the details of the proposed development, I consider that it would represent good design. It would not result in harm to the character or appearance of the area. It has been suggested that the extension should be set further back but this would

not significantly alter its wider impact and would result in a less satisfactory design composition overall.

10. As I have not found there to be any matters that weigh significantly against the proposal, I allow the appeal. I have imposed conditions relating to the commencement of development and the details of the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning. I have required that the materials match the dwelling to ensure that the development would have a satisfactory appearance.

Peter Eggleton

INSPECTOR