



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 March 2011

by **Chris Checkley BA(Hons) MRTPI**

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

Decision date: 17 March 2011

Appeal Ref: APP/H0738/D/11/2146451/WF

24 Washford Close, Ingleby Barwick, Stockton-on-Tees, TS17 0FY

- 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 Carlo Orsi against the decision of the Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council.
 - The application, Ref 10/2876/FUL dated 8 November 2010, was refused by notice dated 10 January 2011.
 - The development proposed is loft conversion with raised roof and roof windows.
-

Decision

1. I dismiss the appeal.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development upon the appearance and character of the host dwelling and the street scene.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a detached two-storey pitched roof house with a front gable. It stands near the head of a cul-de-sac within a modern residential estate. The immediate area is characterised by detached houses of a varying mix on relatively level land, which share a number of design themes and exhibit broad similarity in terms of their general scale and heights of roof ridgelines and eaves.
 4. The proposed loft conversion would include raising the roof structure and inserting two rooflights within both new roof pitches to the front and rear and a new side window at second floor level within the side gable. The height of the eaves and the main ridgeline would be increased by about 600mm and 1250mm respectively. The new roof structure would comprise a greater proportion of the overall front and rear elevations.
 5. The house would become noticeably taller than the others in the vicinity. Its new roof, together with the uncharacteristically increased brickwork above the first floor windows, would also become a more dominating element in the proportions of the house. The house would look significantly different to its neighbours, slightly top heavy in proportions, with the addition of a third floor of accommodation becoming apparent. The upwardly-extended house would
-

lose its aesthetic balance and would appear out of scale and character with those around it, standing out in an unwelcome and obtrusive manner within the street scene of the cul-de-sac.

6. I note the appellant's comments about the manner in which the application was determined and the reported content of the discussions after the refusal was issued, but these do not affect my conclusions on the planning merits of the application that is before me in this appeal.
7. I conclude that the development proposed would harm the appearance and character of the host dwelling and the street scene. These effects would be contrary to the provisions of saved Policy HO12 of the adopted Stockton on Tees Local Plan, Policy CS3 of the Core Strategy and the guidelines of the Supplementary Planning Guidance Note 2: Householder Extension Design Guide that in combination seek extensions that are in scale and character with the existing property and the street scene. Therefore, the appeal must fail.

C J Checkley

INSPECTOR