



## 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](mailto:enquiries@pins.gsi.gov.uk)

**Decision date:**  
24 March 2010

---

### Appeal Ref: APP/H0738/D/10/2121130

#### 60 Flodden Way, Low Grange, Billingham, Stockton-on-Tees, TS23 3LG

- 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 Carl Woods against the decision of Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council.
- The application Ref 09/1912/FUL, dated 27 July 2009, was refused by notice dated 14 October 2009.
- The development proposed is a single storey extension to the front of the dwelling.

#### Decision

1. I dismiss the appeal.

#### Main issue

2. I consider that the main issue is the effect of the proposed front extension on the character and appearance of the area.

#### Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two storey end-terrace dwelling, at the end of a row of similar dwellings. The dwellings have relatively modest front gardens and face onto an open communal green space.
4. The proposed extension would project 1.5 metres across the full width of the dwelling, with a bay window projecting a further 200mm from the front elevation. It would have a lean-to roof, tiled to match the existing house roof, and the door and windows would match those of the existing dwelling.
5. Guidance in the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance 2: Householder Extension Guide (SPG2) states that, with the exception of porches, front extensions are not normally appropriate as they would disrupt the building line and be highly obtrusive. Similarly Policies GP1 and HO12 of the Stockton-on-Tees Local Plan (LP) seek to ensure that development harmonises with the street scene and compliments the character of the area.
6. I appreciate that the extension would be similar in style to the existing frontage of the dwelling. However, due to its projection forward of the building line, it would appear as a bulky and dominant addition to the front of No. 60, harmful to the appearance of the general street scene. I note that the appellant considers that the extension would be similar to others in the area. However, on my site visit I did not see any other single storey extensions across the full width of dwellings in the area, and, although I saw several dwellings on

Flodden Way with front porches, most of the dwellings retain their original frontages.

7. In my view, the presence of these porches do not overcome or justify the harm that would be caused by the proposed front extension. I conclude that the proposed extension would appear as an incongruous addition to No. 60, harmful to the character and appearance of the area, and contrary to LP Policies GP1 and HO12 and guidance in SPG2.

*Jacqueline North*

Inspector