



## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 August 2008

by **R R Lyon MA CEng MICE MRTPI FIHT**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State  
for Communities and Local Government

The Planning Inspectorate  
4/11 Eagle Wing  
Temple Quay House  
2 The Square  
Temple Quay  
Bristol BS1 6PN

☎ 0117 372 6372  
email: enquiries@pins.gsi.gov.uk

Decision date:  
5 September 2008

---

### Appeal Ref: APP/H0738/A/08/2073819

#### 8 Valley Gardens, Eaglescliffe, Stockton-on-Tees TS16 0LY

- 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 White against the decision of Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council.
- The application Ref 07/3431/FUL, dated 11 December 2007, was refused by notice dated 6 February 2008.
- The development proposed is raise the existing ridge line and form loft conversion in new loft space.

---

#### Decision

1. I allow the appeal, and grant planning permission to raise the existing ridge line and form loft conversion in new loft space at 8 Valley Gardens, Eaglescliffe, Stockton-on-Tees TS16 0LY in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 07/3431/FUL, dated 11 December 2007, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
  - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
  - 2) No development shall take place until samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the building hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

#### Reasons

2. Beyond the junction sites associated with Urray Nook Road, Valley Gardens curves steeply downhill to the south. Bungalows dominate, the front elevations of which are staggered on the curve, but not uniformly. Nor do the ridges descend in uniform steps. Most bungalows have exposed stone chimney stacks from ground level to about ridge height, some topped out in various types of brick. Notably, No.10 neighbouring the appeal site does not have a stack.
  3. The proposal would raise the ridge by about 0.7m, placing it about 0.5m above the top of the stack. I saw no other property with such a difference. However, give that the street has no formal protection, I judge that the heights and positions of ridges and stacks are sufficiently random in the street for this discrepancy to have no material effect on the street scene. Also, although No.10 is below No.8, the increased height would be masked by the roof's gradient and the velux windows would not overlook that property. I judge that the proposal would have no materially harmful effect on the occupiers of No.10. I conclude that the proposal would not conflict with saved policies GP1
-

and HO12 of Stockton-on-Tees Local Plan and Supplementary Planning Guidance No.2 (Household Extensions).

4. Apart from the usual commencement condition, I will impose a condition requiring the Council's approval to external finishing materials to ensure the integration of the proposal into the street scene.

*R.R.Lyon*  
INSPECTOR