

---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10<sup>th</sup> December 2013

**by Helen Heward BSc (Hons) MRTPI**

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

**Decision date: 14 January 2014**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/H0738/D/13/2206194**

**28 Coverdale Road, Stockton-on-Tees, Cleveland TS19 7EA**

- 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 Z Din against the decision of Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council.
  - The application Ref 13/1188/FUL was refused by notice dated 5 July 2013.
  - The development proposed is a part single storey and part two storey side extension.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Procedural Issue

2. The appellant has submitted copies of plans for a revised design which has been submitted to the Council, but there is no evidence that the plans have been considered by the Council. Therefore, I have based my decision on the plans that informed the Council's decision.

### Main issue

3. The main issue is the impact of the proposed side extension upon the character and appearance of the main dwelling and the street scene.

### Reasons

4. No 28 is a detached house occupying a prominent position at the corner of Coverdale Road and Autumn Grove. A brick wall with a dense evergreen hedgerow on the boundary, and a close boarded fence within the site, partially screen the ground floor from view. The first floor and roof are clearly visible.
5. The locality comprises a mixture of houses and bungalows on straight, regular building lines set back behind short front and side gardens. Dwellings on corner plots, including No 28, are mostly set at an angle to turn the street corner. No 28 and most of the two storey houses have principal ridges parallel to the road. These features give the locality a relatively uniform character.
6. There is an existing flat roof, single storey, side and forward projecting sitting room. However, it is the alignment of the two storey front wall, not the sitting room, which forms the important building line in the street scene. It is this wall and the roof above that can be seen more widely and which give the appearance of the house turning the corner of Coverdale Road and Autumn Grove.

7. The Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance on Householder Extensions (SPG No. 2) emphasises that extensions should respect the street scene (paragraph 2.2), complement the main house (paragraph 2.5) and maintain the character of the house and wider street by continuing the original building theme (paragraph 8.5). Notwithstanding the appellant's submission that no. 28 "has never been extended" the existing flat-roof sitting room element does not appear to be a part of the main house in visual terms, having a rather different design and appearance, both compared to the host property and to other houses in the locality.
8. The sitting room would be retained. Above, the first floor of the side extension would project approximately 1m in front of the existing main front elevation, and 1m beyond the rear elevation, making it noticeably deeper than the main house. With a width of 6.3m the extension would extend the width of the main front and rear elevations by more than half of the existing width.
9. The ridge would be at the level of, and at right angles to, the principal ridge of the main house. Large gables on the front and rear elevations would span the full width of the extension, extend up to the ridge and, to some degree, mimic an extension at No 26 Coverdale Road.
10. The sitting room and most of the ground floor of the extension would be partially screened from view. However there would be clear views of the front, side and rear of the first floor and roof structure. The long side wall and uncharacteristic large, wide gables to the front and rear would appear disproportionate and out of character with the design and proportions of the main house. In this corner position, and projecting forward of the main building line, the overly large extension would not blend in; but would draw the eye and be a dominant and incongruous feature in this prominent position; detrimental to the character and appearance of the street scene.
11. For these reasons I conclude that the extension fails to follow the advice in SPG No. 2, and saved policy HO12 of the Stockton on Tees Local Plan which requires, amongst other things, that extensions to dwellings are in keeping with the street scene in terms of style and proportions. The proposal also fails to meet the objectives of Policy CS3 of the Stockton on Tees Core Strategy Development Plan Document, March 2010 which seeks to ensure that new development makes a positive contribution to the local area.
12. These policies are broadly consistent with advice in Section 7 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) that good design should contribute positively to making better places for people; that it is proper to seek to promote or reinforce local distinctiveness and that permission should be refused for poor design that fails to take the opportunities for improving the character and quality of an area. Accordingly I conclude that the proposal is also contrary to advice in the Framework.
13. I have sympathy with the appellant's wish to add accommodation for a growing family but, for the reasons I have stated above, I believe it would be wrong to allow the appeal. Therefore the appeal is dismissed.

*Helen Heward*

INSPECTOR