



## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 October 2018

**by Chris Baxter BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 07 November 2018**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/W0734/D/18/3200232**

**4 Malvern Drive, Middlesbrough TS5 8JB**

- 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 Nabeel Rashid against the decision of Middlesbrough Borough Council.
  - The application Ref 17/0469/FUL, dated 2 August 2017, was refused by notice dated 19 March 2018.
  - The development proposed is a two storey rear extension, single storey side/rear extension and porch to front.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Preliminary Matter

2. Although the proposed development seeks a number of additions to the property, the Council concerns relates only to the single-storey element of the scheme. I am content to determine the appeal on the same basis.

### Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

### Reasons

4. The area is characterised by semi-detached properties on modest plots with long rear garden areas. The appeal site reflects the character of the area and also includes a detached garage and shed to the rear. A number of properties in the area have detached buildings and additions to the rear.
5. The proposed single storey side and rear extension would amount to a large bulky addition which would, in my judgement, dominate the existing property, and the removal of the existing garage and shed would not amount to successful compensation for the excessive size of the proposed extension. Because of its size, the proposed single storey extension would not appear subordinate to the property.
6. The proposal is mostly screened from views from the front by the existing property and partly screened from views from 2 and 6 Malvern Drive by existing buildings and boundary treatment. However, the extensions would be readily visible from the majority of neighbouring properties, particularly from

first floor windows. I note the presence of outbuildings and additions to the rear of adjacent properties in the area, and I concur with the appellant that they are not laid out in a uniformed fashion. However from what I have observed, these are not of the same scale as the proposed extension. I am satisfied that the overall scale and bulk of the single storey extension would amount to overdevelopment and would be intrusive to the detriment of the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

7. I note the appellants assertion that sufficient garden space would remain, and of his personal circumstances for a larger property. However, neither outweighs my concerns over the harm caused to the character of the area for the reasons given above.
8. I also note the appellant's assertion that a detached outbuilding could also be constructed under permitted development rights within the rear garden area. I have no substantive evidence to indicate that there is a significant probability that this alternative scheme including a detached outbuilding would be constructed should this appeal be dismissed. This limits the weight that I can attach to it as a fallback position.
9. The proposed single storey side and rear extension would be an incongruous feature that would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The proposal would not accord with policies DC1 and CS5 of Middlesbrough Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2008 which seek to secure a high standard of design for all development, ensuring that it is well integrated with the immediate and wider context.

### **Conclusion**

10. For the reasons set out above, the proposed development would not accord with the development plan and therefore the appeal should be dismissed.

*Chris Baxter*

INSPECTOR