



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 December 2017

by Jason Whitfield BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 14th December 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/W0734/D/17/3182822
33 Malvern Drive, Middlesbrough TS5 8JD

- 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 Ms Ann Forster against the decision of Middlesbrough Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 17/0275/FUL, dated 25 April 2017, was refused by notice dated 6 July 2017.
 - The development proposed is described as “a two storey side extension to match the main house, which is set in a terraced block, with a single storey rear extension.”
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal relates to a two-storey dwelling within an area characterised by two-storey housing. It is located at one side of a terraced block of three properties which, as a whole, exhibit a high degree of symmetry and balance. With paired ground and first floor bay windows, the front elevation of the appeal property and 37 Malvern Drive protrude forward of the central property of No 35 which contains a central brick porch. The block is one of three arranged around the junction of Malvern Drive and Virginia Gardens – two blocks sit either side of the junction with one directly opposite. The strong sense of balance and symmetry in the spatial pattern of the blocks and their architectural composition makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area.
4. It is proposed to construct a single storey rear extension. The Council has raised no particular objection to it and I have no reason to come to an alternative view. It is, nevertheless, also proposed to construct a two-storey extension to the side of the appeal property which would adjoin the rear extension. Given its location on a corner plot, the side extension would not result in any potential terracing effect. The extension would also feature bay windows at ground and first floor and a hipped roof, reflecting the design of the original property.

5. However, whilst it would be set in from the side boundary, the extension would project into the side garden, bringing the property closer to the footpath on Virginia Gardens and thus featuring prominently in the street scene. Furthermore, with a width of around 3.4m, the extension would sit flush with the front elevation of the property at both ground and first floor whilst the roof of the extension would continue the existing ridge height. Although the width would be around half that of the original dwelling, and in itself would not dominate the property, it would nevertheless result in a considerable elongation of the terrace. In my view, that would result in a harmful erosion of the positive sense of symmetry and balance created by the existing property and the terrace as a whole. As a consequence, the side extension would appear as an incongruous and obtrusive feature within the street scene.
6. I conclude, therefore, that the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host property and the area. As a result, it would conflict with Policies CS5 and DC1 of the Middlesbrough Local Development Framework Core Strategy (2008) which seek to secure a high standard of design for all development.
7. It would also conflict with the high quality design aims of the National Planning Policy Framework and the overall guidance set out in the Middlesbrough Urban Design Supplementary Planning Document (2013) which states that on a corner plot, the design of side extensions is a fundamental issue as the extension can often be very prominent.

Other Matters

8. I note there is a two-storey extension at 36 Malvern Drive. However, No 36 is a semi-detached property and does not form part of a terrace in the way the appeal property does. As such the presence of the extension at No 36 would not outweigh the harm I have identified. I have also been referred to an extension recently granted permission at 6 Mandale Road. However, I have little detail of that case and cannot, therefore, be sure that the circumstances in that instance are comparable to those here. In any event, I have considered this appeal on its own merits.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Jason Whitfield

INSPECTOR