



## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 January 2022

by **J Symmons, BSc (Hons) CEng MICE**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25<sup>th</sup> January 2022

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/W0734/D/21/3285967**  
**20 Canberra Road, Middlesbrough TS7 8EX**

- 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 & Mrs Mann against the decision of Middlesbrough Council.
  - The application Ref 21/0371/FUL, dated 12 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 18 August 2021.
  - The development proposed is a two-storey side extension and single storey extensions to front & rear.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Preliminary Matters

2. The appellants provided a plan named Revision C with their appeal statement. The Council has confirmed that Revision C is the appropriate plan for determination. I have dealt with this appeal accordingly.

### Main Issue

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

### Reasons

4. The area surrounding the appeal property predominately contains a mix of semi-detached properties with bay windows, drives and garden/paved areas to the frontages. Many of these do not have extensions. There are limited examples of two-storey side extensions adjoining pairs of semi-detached properties within the area, with the nearest ones to the proposal being at 22 – 32 Canberra Road, between Newham Crescent and Perth Crescent. Porches of different designs are evident within the area. The rear gardens are reasonably large and there is a mix of outbuildings and single and two-storey rear extensions.
5. The appeal site is a two-storey semi-detached property with front bay windows, side garage and a single storey rear extension. It has a hipped roof to the main building, flat roof to the garage and a mono-pitched roof to the rear extension. There is a relatively small garden and single drive to the front and a larger rear garden enclosed by fencing. The detached neighbouring property, No 22, has a large two-storey side extension which is set back from its building line and extends very close to No 20's boundary. The houses at Nos 20 and 22 splay slightly to reflect the bend in Canberra Road.

6. The proposal would replace the garage with a two-storey hip roofed side extension and add a single storey front extension with a mono-pitched roof. The porch detail would retain the main entrance door but also replaces the garage door with another main entrance door. Furthermore, a single storey pitched roof extension would be added to the rear of the property.
7. The Council has produced Middlesbrough's Urban Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD, 2013). This document sets out design guidance and standards expected by the Council for development. Amongst other matters, the SPD identifies the key issues and design approaches that need to be considered in deciding if the addition of side extensions, porches, and rear extensions would be appropriate.
8. The side extension would be generally in accordance with the SPD in terms of stepping back the extension's first floor section from the front building line and lowering the roof ridge. It would also be in keeping with the host property and would be smaller in scale than No 22's extension. However, the combined effect of the proposal with No 22's extension would be to largely infill the gap between the properties. This would remove the existing separation, be overly dominant, and would result effectively in terracing of the properties. Consequently, the side extension would have an overbearing impact.
9. The example photograph in the SPD referred to by the appellants shows an extension similar to the proposal. However, the two-storey extension is shown as being adjacent to a single storey garage which retains an open and separate aspect, in contrast to the proposed development.
10. Three pairs of semi-detached properties along Canberra Road at Nos 22 - 32, have had extensions which have already resulted in a terracing effect. Furthermore, a number of these properties have been extended to the rear, including a large extension at No 30. However, these developments occurred prior to the SPD's adoption. In any event, the proposed development would extend this existing terracing by an additional property and would therefore be harmful to the character and appearance of the area.
11. Regarding the front porch addition, this would comply with the SPD in terms of general size and extent. Notwithstanding this and the amendments made to the porch design during the planning application process, the design remains inappropriate. This is due to the somewhat unusual duplication of front doors to the proposed side extension and porch.
12. There are a number of examples of single storey rear extensions locally. With the mix of other extensions, outbuildings and features in rear gardens, I find that the proposed rear extension would not harm the character and appearance of the host property or the area.
13. I acknowledge that the cumulative increase in the floor area of the host property from the proposal would be significant. However, there is no limit set in the SPD for additional floor area. While I consider that the combined effect of all the elements of the proposal would not be out of scale with the host property or other houses locally, my concern about the side extension's terracing and the porch's unusual duplicate door arrangement remains.
14. While the Core Strategy is of some age, there is nothing before me which would indicate that the aforementioned policies are not relevant in this

instance. I also note that the proposed development was amended during the planning application process. However, the application was refused, and I have considered this appeal on its own merits.

15. I conclude that the proposal would significantly harm the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. This would be contrary to Policies DC1 and CS5 of the Middlesbrough Core Strategy 2008 and the SPD which seek to ensure, amongst other matters, that all new development delivers high quality design in terms of layout, form and contribution to the character and appearance of the area. The Council has referred to DC1(c) in their decision notice, but it appears that this relates to living conditions. Accordingly, I have addressed Policy DC1 more generally as it also deals with character and appearance matters.

### **Conclusion**

16. For the reasons given, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*J Symmons*

INSPECTOR