



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 March 2010

by **Jacqueline North BSc MSc**

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:
24 March 2010

Appeal Ref: APP/H0738/D/10/2119617
15 Beckwith Road, Yarm, TS15 9TG

- 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 K Meynell against the decision of Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council.
- The application Ref 09/1948/FUL, dated 30 July 2009, was refused by notice dated 16 October 2009.
- The development proposed is a 2 storey rear extension with new garage to the side of property, porch to the front of property with new canopy pitched roof.

Decision

1. I dismiss the appeal.

Main issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposed extension on: (i) the living conditions of the occupiers of adjacent dwellings with particular regard to visual impact and potential loss of light; and (ii) the character and appearance of the dwelling and the area.

Reasons

3. 15 Beckwith Drive is a two storey detached dwelling, the adjacent dwelling at No. 17 to the east is also a two storey detached house, whilst No. 11 to the west is a detached bungalow which is set back from the front of No. 15. The development proposed comprises a number of extensions including a part single and part two storey extension to the rear of the dwelling. The single storey element would project a little under 2m further than the existing one along the shared boundary with No. 17, with a two storey extension over about half of it.
 4. The proposal would also include a single storey garage extension flush to the front of the house. This would replace an existing detached garage that is set to the rear of the dwelling. Part of the rear extension would wrap around this western side of the dwelling to form part of the rear of the new garage. A front porch and new pitched roof across the front of the dwelling are also proposed.
 5. The scale and height of the rear extension and its proximity to the boundary would lead it to appear as a large and unpleasantly overbearing addition when seen from the living room window, patio and rear garden of No. 17. It would therefore have an unacceptable visual impact which would be harmful to the living conditions of the occupiers of this neighbouring property, and would not
-

comply with LP Policies GP1 and HO12 in respect of their aim to protect the living conditions of neighbours.

6. The rear garden, patio area and rear living room window of No. 17 are in shade for part of the day due to the proximity and size of the existing single storey extension. However, I consider that this would be exacerbated due to the substantial increase in scale and height of the proposed rear extension. This would also be harmful to the living conditions of the occupiers of No. 17, and would not accord with LP Policies GP1 and HO12.
7. The side elevation of 11 Beckwith Drive, containing the only window serving the kitchen, faces directly onto the site of the proposed garage. There is an existing separation distance of about 4.8m between the side walls of these neighbouring dwellings; this would be halved if the new garage were erected. This separation is well below that recommended in the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance Note 2: *Household Extension Design Guide* (SPD2). At this short distance the considerable scale and height of the extensions would appear overbearing when seen from the kitchen window, there would also be overshadowing resulting in a significant loss of light. This would be harmful to the living conditions of the occupiers of the bungalow, and contrary to SPD2 and LP Policies GP1 and HO12.
8. Construction of the proposed extensions would significantly increase the footprint of the dwelling with the result that approximately half of the plot would be developed. This would substantially reduce the area of amenity space available for the use of the occupiers of the dwelling, especially in the private rear garden, and the extensions would appear as oversized additions to a relatively small dwelling. The proposal would not respect the scale of No. 11 or other dwellings in the area, and would therefore be harmful to the character and appearance of the dwelling and the area. This would not accord with LP Policies GP1 and HO12 which seek to ensure that development respects and complements its surroundings with particular regard to style, proportion and materials.

Jacqueline North

Inspector