
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 January 2014

by Roger Catchpole BSc (Hons) PhD Dip Hort MCIEEM

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

Decision date: 13 January 2014

Appeal Ref: APP/H0738/D/13/2209471

32 Beckwith Road, Yarm, Stockton-on-Tees TS15 9TG

- 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 Mrs S Edwards against the decision of Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 13/2238/FUL, dated 28 August 2013, was refused by notice dated 30 October 2013.
 - The development proposed is a single storey front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The host property is located in a residential area, of recent origin, characterised by small detached properties interspersed with bungalows. A sense of spaciousness is present that originates from the combined effect of open front gardens and set back building lines. The host property is situated on a prominent corner plot at the junction of Beckwith Road and Everingham Road. It has undergone significant alteration since construction with a twin apex, two storey extension to its southern elevation and an L-shaped ground floor extension to its western elevation.
4. These alterations have significantly increased its mass in notable contrast to the majority of properties in the local area. The proposed addition of another extension to its eastern elevation, albeit of modest proportions, would further strengthen this contrast to the point of conspicuous incongruity. Whilst the proposal would not be visible from nearby properties on Beckwith Road it would still, nonetheless, be clearly visible to pedestrians and drivers using this route. Furthermore, I observe that the property can be seen from multiple viewpoints along Everingham Road. Although extensions to other properties are visible, the cumulative impact of the proposal on the host property would be significantly greater in the light of previous enlargement.
5. Although only projecting about 2.1m from the existing elevation, the proposed extension would also unbalance the building line on the south western side of

Beckwith Road. I observe that the host property is currently on the same line as Nos. 30, 22 and 20 whilst the intervening houses, Nos. 24-28, are set back on a different line. The extension would disrupt this layout and form a dominant front façade that would contrast negatively with the established street scene. The Appellant has argued that a similar extension has been granted permission on Coulson Close. Whilst there are some apparent similarities, I have no evidence before me concerning the circumstances of that permission or whether it predates current planning policy. Furthermore, the property is not part of the immediate street scene and the front elevation is also not visible from the appeal site. I therefore give this little weight in the balance of this appeal.

6. I conclude that the increased massing, disruption of the established building line and dominant front façade would result in significant material harm to the character and appearance of the property and the surrounding area. I therefore find it would be contrary to paragraph 131 of the *National Planning Policy Framework 2012* (the Framework); policy CS3(8) of the Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council Local Development Framework *Core Strategy DPD 2010*; and saved policy HO12 of the Stockton-on-Tees *Local Plan 1997* that seek, among other things, to ensure that new development respects the character of individual houses and local areas. I also find that it would fail to meet the requirements of section 4 of the Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council Supplementary Planning Guidance Note 2: *Householder Extension Guide 2004*.

Other Matters

7. The Appellant has argued that the proposal is sustainable. However, paragraph 8 of the Framework makes it clear that sustainable development can only be achieved where economic, social and environmental aims are sought jointly. Furthermore, paragraph 9 goes on to state that sustainable development involves seeking positive improvements to the quality of the built and natural environment. Given the harm to local character that would be likely to result, I conclude that this development would not be sustainable and that it is also, therefore, contrary to paragraph 9 of the Framework.
8. The Appellant has made reference to "an extension of 5.4 x 1.4 meters with gable ends" but has provided no further detail concerning its location. Furthermore, since I have no evidence before me concerning the circumstances of that permission I give this little weight in the balance of this appeal.
9. For the above reasons, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Roger Catchpole

INSPECTOR