



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 April 2021

by Alison Scott BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 April 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/W0734/D/20/3266046

110 Cambridge Road, Middlesbrough, Cleveland TS5 5HP

- 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 Mohammed Rafiq against the decision of Middlesbrough Council.
 - The application Ref 20/0446/FUL, dated 29 July 2020, was refused by notice dated 1 October 2020.
 - The development proposed is Kitchen extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site is located on a corner plot with Castleton Avenue. It has been extended to the rear by virtue of a single storey extension to which the appellant seeks to extend towards the perimeter boundary with Castleton Avenue including a hipped roof above the totality of the rear element.
4. The street scene of Castleton Avenue is one of a very defined building line to both sides of the road. As the proposal would extend towards the boundary, it would be visible from the street scene.
5. At a proposed length of approximately 7.2m along the side perimeter boundary, it would distort this regular building line order that is a characteristic feature of the street scene. Its prominence would be further highlighted as it would project beyond the return building line of No 1 Castleton Avenue.
6. Consequently, it would not represent good design but instead result in detrimental harm to the character and appearance of the immediate area.
7. Limited details of the other example extensions brought to my attention have been provided by the appellant for me to consider and in any case, as is my duty, I have considered the proposal and its relationship with the street scene to which it closely relates.

8. I am aware of the implications of the Covid-19 pandemic and the occasions for people to need to self-isolate. However, how this has a bearing on the need for the proposal has not been explained by the appellant. They have told me they have a medical condition and a ground floor bathroom would improve their living conditions. However, there are no substantive details presented with the appeal to allow me to consider this matter further, and therefore I apply moderate weight to this matter.
9. To conclude, in the overall planning balance, the proposal by virtue of its scale and massing and location close to the boundary would have a detrimental effect on the character and appearance of the street scene in conflict with the Middlesbrough Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2008 Policies DC1 and CS5 in their general design aims, as well as the advice contained within the Councils Urban Design Supplementary Planning Document Design 2013.

Conclusion

10. The proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area and would conflict with the development plan taken as a whole. There are no material considerations that indicate the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, for the reasons given, I conclude that the appeal should not succeed.

Alison Scott

INSPECTOR