



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 September 2020

by David Cross BA(Hons) PgDip(Dist) TechIOA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8 October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/W0734/D/20/3256067

75 Southwell Road, Middlesbrough TS5 6NQ

- 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 Azimi against the decision of Middlesbrough Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 20/0119/FUL, dated 25 February 2020, was refused by notice dated 15 June 2020.
 - The development proposed is two storey side extension and dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The description of development in the heading above has been taken from the planning application form. However, in Part E of the appeal form it is stated that the description of development has not changed but, nevertheless, a different wording has been entered. Neither of the main parties has provided written confirmation that a revised description of development has been agreed. Accordingly, I have used the one given on the original application.
3. There is some variation in the name of the appellant as given on the planning application and appeal forms. In the heading above I have used the name as specified on the planning application form. This also reflects the details given on the submitted plans.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are:
 - The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property; and
 - Whether the proposal would make suitable provision for car parking.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

5. The appeal site is one of a pair of semi-detached houses with hipped roofs. This arrangement is repeated along Southwell Road which gives a pleasing rhythm to the streetscape and contributes to the pleasant suburban character of the area.

6. The proposed side extension would project to the boundary with the neighbouring property and would introduce a gabled roof design. Due to the scale and bulk of the extension it would appear as a disproportionate addition to the original building. When combined with the gable roof design, this would unduly unbalance the symmetrical relationship with the attached dwelling to the detriment of the character of both buildings. The set back of the upper floor, lower ridge line and window design would not mitigate the harm arising from the incongruous scale and design of the proposal.
7. The appeal site is also of increased prominence due to its location opposite the junction with Exeter Road, which enables longer distance views of the site.
8. In support of the appeal, my attention has been drawn to other properties in the wider area which have been extended with gable roofs or which incorporate this design in prominent locations. However, I do not have full details of the circumstances that led to those developments being permitted and so cannot be certain that the circumstances are the same as the appeal before me. In any event these other developments do not establish a prevailing context for the appeal proposal which I have determined on its own merits.
9. I conclude that due to its scale, design and location the proposed side extension would lead to unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host building and the area. The proposal would therefore be contrary to the design requirements of Policies DC1 and CS5 of the Council's Core Strategy 2008 (the Core Strategy). The proposal would also conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) with regards to achieving well-designed places. The proposal would also be contrary to the advice of Middlesbrough's Urban Design Supplementary Planning Document 2013 (SPD) with regards to the basic principles which should be applied to extensions.

Parking

10. A driveway and garage to the side and rear of the dwelling provide the current on-site parking provision. It is proposed to retain this arrangement through the introduction of a covered parking bay within the side extension.
11. The Council submits that this bay would not meet its minimum 3x6m standard which would enable car users to park and open doors when a space is enclosed by walls at either side. However, whilst the parking bay may be less than 3m wide at certain points due to structural elements of the proposal, a substantial extent of the internal side wall is set back to increase the available width. It has not been demonstrated that the extents of reduced width would prevent vehicles from accessing the parking space. There is also no substantive evidence that the set back of the side wall would be inadequate to enable the opening of car doors.
12. On the basis of the evidence before me, I conclude that the proposal would provide suitable parking provision. The proposal would therefore not conflict with the highway, transportation and access requirements of Policies DC1 and CS5 of the Core Strategy. The proposal would also not be contrary to the Framework in respect of parking considerations.

Other Matter

13. I am mindful that the appellant wishes to provide additional space for his family. However, this private benefit would not outweigh the significant harm that I have identified.

Conclusion

14. Notwithstanding my conclusions in respect of parking, the proposal would lead to significant harm to the character and appearance of the host property. The proposal would therefore conflict with the development plan and the Framework when read as a whole with regards to achieving well-designed places.

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

David Cross

INSPECTOR