



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 September 2025

by Mrs Chris Pipe BA(Hons), DipTP, MTP, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 09 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W0734/W/25/3369902

173 Low Gill View, Middlesbrough TS7 8AX

- 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 Michael Bowe against the decision of Middlesbrough Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/0111/FUL.
 - The development is described as retrospective extension to existing summer house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The application made clear that the scheme had been submitted retrospectively, the development was in place at the time of my site visit I have dealt with the proposal accordingly.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the development on the living conditions of occupiers of neighbouring properties.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is a detached property within a predominantly residential area. I observed during my site visit that the neighbouring properties to the rear have detached garages with high pitched roof design.
5. The development is located adjacent the detached garage to the rear of No. 137 Low Gill View, which has a higher roof than the development. During my site visit I observed the development from the rear garden of No. 137. Windows from No. 137 face directly onto rear garden of the appeal site. Whilst the garage at No. 137 screens the development to a degree, the scale and location of the outbuilding is a prominent feature which dominates the outlook from the neighbouring gardens to the rear.
6. The appellant and Council agree that the development is not permitted development due to the height and proximity to the boundary. The design and materials match the original outbuilding which the development extends. Nevertheless, the substantial flat roof outbuilding at a height of 2.99m is prominent and overbearing to the occupiers of the neighbouring properties.

7. The appellant has drawn my attention to an approved development at 13 Gypsy Lane which they consider a similar scenario. I have not been provided with substantive evidence to compare this development to the one before me, therefore I give this limited weight.
8. I find that the development would harm the living conditions of occupiers of neighbouring properties. There is conflict with Policies DC1 of the Middlesbrough Local Development Framework, Core Strategy (2008) which amongst other things seeks to ensure developments are of high quality which have minimal effect on the amenities of occupiers of nearby properties.
9. There is conflict with the Middlesbrough's Urban Design Guide, Supplementary Planning Document (2013) which amongst other things seeks to ensure extensions do not dominate neighbouring properties.

Other Matters

10. The appellant has highlighted that the development is required to support home working and flexible living. I have not been provided with evidence to demonstrate that the development would be the only way to fulfil any need of the appellant. I give this limited weight.

Conclusion

11. For the above reasons I conclude that this appeal should be dismissed.

Chris Pipe

INSPECTOR