



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 January 2013

**by George Arrowsmith BA, MCD, MRTPI**

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

**Decision date: 14 January 2013**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/H0738/D/2185418**  
**135-137 Mansfield Avenue, Thornaby, TS17 1JB**

- 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 Tariq Mahmood against the decision of Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council.
  - The application Ref 12/1676/REV, dated 5 July 2012, was refused by notice dated 6 September 2012.
  - The development proposed is a two storey extension to front at 135-137 Mansfield Avenue; two storey extension to rear at 137 Mansfield Avenue; single storey extension to rear and new bay window to the front at first floor level at 135 Mansfield Avenue, and the erection of a 1.5m high boundary wall to the front of 135 and 137 Mansfield Avenue.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether the two storey extension that would fill the gap between Nos 135 and 137 would harm the street scene.

### Reasons

3. There are two aspects to the Council's concern about the impact on the street scene. The first is that the proposal would create a terraced property that would be out of character with the surrounding area. In this regard I find the Council's characterisation of the surrounding area somewhat misleading. It is true that the houses on this side of Mansfield Avenue are semi-detached, as are those further to the east and south. However the houses on the opposite side of Mansfield Avenue are arranged in short terraces. There is a terrace of three houses immediately opposite the appeal site and terraces of five and six houses a little further to the north. In this context I do not think that forming another short terrace by linking Nos 135 and 137 would necessarily harm the street scene.
4. Even though I do not find fault with the principle of linking Nos 135 and 137 it is necessary to consider the details of how the linkage is proposed. The drawing submitted with the application shows that the extensions would repeat the hipped roof design of the existing properties but would be set back from the

existing frontages and have a slightly lower ridge height. The extended hips would be separated by a valley gutter. The roofscape of the resultant terrace extending from 133 to 139 Mansfield Road would then have a complicated and unusual appearance, contrasting with the simple continuous roof line of the terrace opposite. I have no doubt that it would appear as an incongruous and intrusive element in the street scene and would therefore conflict with the objectives of saved policy HO12 in the Stockton-on-Tees Local Plan.

5. The appellant refers to other nearby development, which are said to be similar. None of the examples shown in the photographs submitted by the appellant are the same as what is proposed and I do not know their planning history. Most importantly I must determine the present appeal on its own merits.
6. A number of interested persons are concerned about other elements of the proposal although their concerns are not shared by the Council. In particular the officer's report comments that the replacement of a 4.2m deep conservatory by an extension of similar depth is acceptable. If I had found the proposal satisfactory in all other respects I would have sought the parties' further views on this matter because a brickwork side wall would not have the same effect on the neighbouring property as a conservatory. However, since I find the proposal unacceptable for other reasons this is unnecessary.

*George Arrowsmith*

INSPECTOR

