



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 November 2010

by **D R Cullingford** BA MPhil MRTPI

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:
9 November 2010

Appeal Ref: APP/H0738/D/10/2135866

39 Darlington Road, Hartburn, Stockton-on-Tees, TS18 5EJ

- 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 Brian Johnson against the decision of the Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council.
- The application (ref: 10/1334/FUL and dated 27 May 2010) was refused by notice dated 9 August 2010.
- The development is described as the erection of a 'single storey rear lounge/sun room extension and first floor side/bedroom extension'.

Decision

1. For the reasons given below, and in exercise of the powers transferred to me, I dismiss the appeal.

Reasons

2. The Council are concerned that the height, size and proximity of the blank façade of this 2-storey side extension would have an unacceptable and overbearing impact on neighbouring residents at No.41, contrary to 'saved' policy H012 and the guidance set out in their SPG Note 2. As the Council accept, and I agree, that the single storey rear extension accommodating a lounge-cum-sunroom would be acceptable and that the design of the scheme as a whole would largely be in keeping with the street scene, it is the impact of the 2-storey side extension that forms the issue on which this appeal turns.
 3. I saw that the appeal property is one of a variety of solid detached dwellings that contribute to the suburban street scene here. The neighbouring property at No.41 is a little unusual in having a small timber and glass structure (referred to variously as a 'sunroom' or 'porch') enclosing a kitchen door and window on the side elevation. There is a further kitchen window in that side elevation as well as windows serving cloakrooms, bathrooms, 'cupboards' and landings (though several are fitted with obscure glazing) overlooking the modest space (about 3.8m wide) at the side of No.41.
 4. The 2-storey side extension would project roughly 4m from the main side elevation of the appeal property and result in a large blank flank wall about 7.4m high extending over 10m along, and only just beyond, the property boundary. I am afraid that such a structure in such a position would be seen to loom above the space at the side of No.41 obliterating much of the sky currently evident from the kitchen windows, as well as from the 'porch-cum-sunroom'. I think that the bleak prospect presented by that blank façade, together with the proximity of the structure to the boundary, would accentuate
-

its oppressive presence and impart an unpleasant perception of incarceration behind a tall confining wall. I appreciate that the kitchen at No.41 benefits from a window with an outlook across the rear garden. But (with the helpful permission of the agents) I saw that that window is fairly modest and looks out above a sink between protruding structures. In contrast, the kitchen windows in the side elevation are larger and the kitchen appears to be configured to take advantage of light from that quarter. I agree that the 'porch-cum-sunroom' is something of a hybrid structure. But, it is certainly large enough to accommodate a wicker table and chairs (and did so when I saw it) and it would offer quite a pleasant place in which to enjoy the morning light. I consider that the proposed extension would render those rooms more dark and dreary. And, I think that the cumulative impact of all those harmful effects would seriously impair the prospect neighbouring residents might reasonably expect to enjoy in a suburban area such as this. For those reasons, I consider that the proposal would be contrary to 'saved' policy H012 and the guidance set out in the relevant SPG.

5. I have considered all the other matters raised. It seems to me that the situation at 46 Redwing Lane (APP/H0738/A/05/1185192) is a little different, the impact of the extension there affecting a south and east facing conservatory rather than this east and north facing 'porch-cum-sunroom'. Similarly, the blank façade presented by the flats on Yarm Road lies to the north and at a right angle to the nearest window of the adjacent bungalow, thereby differing from the relationship evident at the appeal property. Hence, I am afraid that I find nothing sufficiently compelling to alter my conclusion that this appeal should be dismissed.



INSPECTOR