



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 March 2025

by **C Mayes CMLI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 April 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W0734/D/25/3359421

3 Kennthorpe, Nunthorpe, Middlesbrough TS7 0PS

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr R Yassin against the decision of Middlesbrough Council.
 - The application ref is 24/0381/FUL.
 - The development proposed is described as: Proposed single storey side extension, dormer to rear and 2no dormers to front.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the site and the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property forms the left-hand half of a pair of single-storey semi-detached homes. The appeal property is located on a corner plot toward the centre of a cul-de-sac comprised of similar single-storey semi-detached homes in a suburban residential area. The homes are constructed from buff brick with, predominantly, plain tiled roofs. Within the cul-de-sac properties are evenly distributed in modest plots with open frontages. The homes are evenly proportioned and grouped along stepped building lines along each side of the road resulting in a balanced and consistent form and pattern of development.
4. The proposed development would substantially extend one half of the pair of semi-detached homes by approximately one third resulting in a double-fronted appearance to one half of the pair. This would disrupt the marked balance, form and consistent pattern of both the pair of homes and wider area described above. The proposed development would extend beyond the building line established by the frontages of Nos 1 and 2 Kennthorpe and the current end, gable wall of the host property. As such, the proposed development would have a significant negative effect on the character and appearance of the host property and area.
5. The proposed development includes 2 gabled dormer windows to the front elevation, aligned with existing windows below, and a flat-roofed dormer window along the full length of the extended rear elevation. Gabled dormer windows are not present elsewhere on buildings within the context of the appeal site. The proposed flat-roofed dormer window to the rear of the host property would add significant mass to the rear elevation. As such, and notwithstanding the alignment

of windows to the front elevation, the proposed front and rear dormer windows would be incongruous and disruptive features that would dominate both roof planes of the host dwelling. Not only would the front and rear of the host property appear unbalanced but the relationship with the neighbouring half of the pair of semi-detached homes would also be unbalanced. Consequently, the proposed dormer windows would have a significant, harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host property and area.

6. The appellant has drawn my attention to the presence of flat-roofed dormer windows on other properties in the area. These examples result in an unbalanced appearance in the roofs to each pair of semi-detached homes, although the width and broad proportions of each pair of homes in question remains in balance. I also note that several properties have been extended to include porches and carports, and in one case a side extension. These additions may not maintain the balanced appearance of the pairs of semi-detached homes of the area as originally built. Therefore, they do not contribute positively to the character of the area. But they are, in each case, subservient in appearance to their host dwelling. Rather than providing justification for the development in question, if anything, their presence points to the need for such proposals to be carefully controlled if the character and appearance of the area is to be safeguarded. In any case, none of the examples before me is directly comparable to the appeal development before me and I have no evidence as to how or when they came about. As circumstances vary from one site to another, I have considered this appeal on its merits.
7. I acknowledge the appellant's aims to elevate the dwelling to modern standards, increase living space and improve quality of life for occupiers. However, these are not benefits of sufficient weight to justify the harm identified above. I also note the proposed use of matching materials, window style and proportions. Moreover, that the proposal would not result in a harmful effect on the privacy of neighbouring occupiers, cause noise or light pollution or impair access. Neither would the proposal have a detrimental effect on highways safety. However, these matters make no difference to my overall decision in light of the harm identified above.
8. Taking the above into account I conclude that the development would have a significant detrimental effect on the character and appearance of the site and area. Hence it would conflict with Policies DC1 and CS5 of the Middlesbrough Local Development Framework Core Strategy, February 2008. Together, these seek, among other things, to ensure that development, through high quality of design, integrates with the immediate and wider context and contributes to the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

9. The proposal conflicts with the development plan and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. For the reasons given above the appeal is dismissed.

C Mayes

INSPECTOR