

---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 February 2016

by **Mark Caine BSc (Hons) MTPL MRTPI**

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

Decision date: 23 February 2016

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/W0734/W/15/3130798**

**Community Centre, Stainsby Road, Middlesbrough, Cleveland**

- 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 Mousa against the decision of Middlesbrough Borough Council.
  - The application Ref M/FP/0599/15/P, dated 14 May 2015, was refused by notice dated 20 July 2015.
  - The development proposed is a porch.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Procedural Matters

2. At the time of my site visit the construction of the porch had begun but had not been completed. The proposed plans were amended following submission to the Council but prior to its determination. These changes, shown in the revised plans have resulted in the introduction of a pitched roof. I am satisfied that all relevant parties have had the opportunity to comment on these amendments and would not be prejudiced. For the avoidance of doubt I therefore confirm that my determination of the appeal is based on the revised drawings submitted as amendments to the original application submission.
3. The application form states that the site address is the Community Centre, Stainsby Road, Middlesbrough, Cleveland but the appellant's appeal form indicates that the appeal site is 2 Reeth Road, Middlesbrough TS5 5HJ. Nonetheless, the appellant has confirmed that an error was made in the appeal form. I have therefore used the site address that was provided in the original application form in the banner heading above.

### Main Issue

4. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the street scene.

### Reasons

5. The appeal relates to a single-storey detached building that is located on a prominent corner location at the junction of Stainsby Road and Acklam Road. Although it is enclosed by paladin security fencing the community centre sits within part of a large grassed landscaped area. Indeed, substantial areas of open space and trees help provide softly landscaped edges to this part of Acklam Road and contribute to its spacious and relatively verdant character.

6. It has been put to me by the appellant that the porch is required to provide disability access to the building, and to allow for footwear to be removed and stored before entering the community hall for worship. I also appreciate that it would offer a degree of protection during adverse weather conditions.
7. Nonetheless, the proposed porch would be prominently sited to the elevation of the building that fronts Acklam Road. It would project outwardly from the existing building by approximately 3 metres and span approximately 3.4 metres in width. Its size, scale and bulk would therefore not only dominate the frontage of the existing building but would also intrude upon the spacious character that is maintained by the relatively open landscaped frontages along this section of Acklam Road.
8. This would be clearly visible through the paladin fencing and from the pedestrian walkway that fronts the appeal site, and Acklam Road itself. As a result it would appear as a dominant, unsympathetic and conspicuous feature in the street scene.
9. I therefore conclude that the proposal would have a significantly harmful effect on the street scene. As such it would conflict with the aims of Policies CS5 and DC1 of the Middlesbrough Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2008 (CS). Amongst other matters these require a high standard of design for all development, taking account of factor such as scale in ensuring that it is well integrated with the immediate and wider context and enhances both the built and natural environments.
10. For the reasons given above, the appeal should therefore be dismissed.

*Mark Caine*

INSPECTOR