



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 October 2017

by John Dowsett MA DipURP DipUD MRTPI

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

Decision date: 7th November 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/W0734/D/17/3176277

6 Heythorp Drive, Middlesbrough, Cleveland TS5 8QA

- 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 H Singh against the decision of Middlesbrough Borough Council.
 - The application Ref: 16/5396/FUL, dated 17 November 2016, was refused by notice dated 8 March 2017.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side extension, garage extension and new roof to rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal building is one half of a pair of semi-detached houses located near the east end of Heythorp Drive. The street, and those leading off it in the vicinity of the appeal site, consists of similar two storey semi-detached houses. Although there are some slight variations in the design of these, they have shared characteristics in the form of similar materials, hipped roofs and two storey bay windows on the front elevations. Combined with regular spacing between the pairs of houses, this results in the area having a very cohesive and homogeneous appearance. The neighbouring pair of semi-detached houses, at 2 and 4 Heythorp Drive, is set at an angle to the remainder of the street on a roughly triangular site formed by the junction of Heythorp Drive and Mandale Road.
4. Policy CS5 of the Middlesbrough Core Strategy 2008 (Core Strategy) expects new development to achieve a high standard of design that is well integrated with the wider context. Core Strategy Policy DC1 seeks to ensure that new development has regard to the visual appearance and layout of the surrounding area and relates well to this. Middlesbrough's Urban Design Supplementary Planning Document 2013 (the SPD) sets out more detailed design guidance in respect of extensions to dwellings and is to be read alongside the more general design policies in the Core Strategy.
5. The SPD states that all extensions should be of a scale that is appropriate to the existing building and subservient to the original house. In respect of side extensions, the SPD expects any first floor element to be set back by one

metre from the front wall of the house and have the ridge of the roof set lower than that of the main building. The proposed extension would meet these requirements for side extensions.

6. However, the SPD also states that, in order to prevent the building becoming out of proportion, a side extension should be no more than half the width of the original dwelling. The original dwelling has a frontage width of 5.8 metres. The two storey element of the proposed extension would have a width of 4 metres, with the single storey garage adding a further 3 metres. This considerably exceeds the width of the original dwelling frontage and would significantly imbalance the proportions of both the original dwelling and those of the semi-detached pair when viewed as a whole, conflicting with the requirements of the SPD. The resulting building would also be inconsistent with the prevailing appearance of the area, which is characterised by regularly spaced pairs of semi-detached houses of similar dimensions and which are broadly symmetrical. Consequently, the proposed extension would appear as an incongruous feature and would not relate well to, or integrate with, its surroundings.
7. Due to the degree of separation from the adjacent dwelling at number 4 Heythorp Drive, and this dwelling being set at an angle to the road, the side elevation of the appeal building is prominent in the street scene when entering the street from the main road, which would exacerbate the visual effect of the proposed extension. Whilst I note the appellant's point that the appeal building has 7 metres of land adjacent to the side elevation, the effect of developing the whole width of this area would result in a disproportionately large extension to the dwelling.
8. When I visited the site, I saw that other dwellings in the vicinity have been extended to the side, however, I do not know the circumstances of these cases or the policies that applied at the time of their consideration. In any event, none of these extensions were as large as that proposed at the appeal building and do not represent a direct parallel to it.
9. The proposal also includes the replacement of the covering to the flat roof of an existing extension to the rear of the appeal building. I note that the Council have not raised this as an issue and this aspect of the proposal is not in dispute between the parties.
10. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. It would not comply with the relevant requirement of Policies CS5 and DC1 of the Core Strategy which seek to ensure that new development is of a high standard of design that has regard to its context and which is well related to the surrounding area in terms of scale and design.

Conclusion

11. For the above reasons, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

John Dowsett

INSPECTOR