
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 February 2016

by F Rafiq BSc (Hons), MCD, MRTPI

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

Decision date: 22 February 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/H0738/D/15/3140570

25 Victoria Road, Stockton-on-Tees, TS19 7EJ

- 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 Phil Arnett against the decision of Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 15/2177/FUL dated 2 September 2015 was refused by notice dated 26 November 2015.
 - The development proposed is a front side and rear extension for garage and kitchen extension with bedroom addition within roof space.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. Upon the request of the Council, I visited No. 1 Logan Drive but was not able to access the rear garden area. I am however satisfied from what I was able to see from the front driveway area, the appeal property itself and the surrounding roads, that I am able to proceed to determine the appeal.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on (1) the living conditions of the occupiers of No. 1 Logan Drive with reference to outlook, and (2) the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

Living Conditions

4. The proposed development includes a side and rear extension to the appeal bungalow, which would contain accommodation in the roofspace. The extension would project to the rear of the existing main building line by around 5.8m towards No. 1 Logan Drive.
 5. This neighbouring property on Logan Drive is set at a right angle to the appeal property, such that its side elevation faces the rear of the appeal building. I note the proposal would result in a larger extension closer to this neighbouring property. There is however a detached garage situated on the boundary with this neighbouring property and I was able to see that the remaining rear
-

boundary between these two properties consists of a close-board fence of around 2m in height. Whilst the garage would be removed, and replaced with an extension with a higher pitched roof, it would also be set away from the boundary. I do not therefore consider that this element of the proposal would have an overbearing effect on the rear garden area of No. 1, despite this space being small and the only private amenity area for this neighbouring property's occupiers. This property also has a largely blank side wall facing the appeal site, apart from an entrance porch, and for this reason, it would also not have any adverse effect on the occupants within this neighbouring dwelling.

6. The proposed rear facing first floor window would give views over the rear garden area of No. 1 but I accept that the requirements for it to be obscure glazed and non-opening could be dealt with by condition.
7. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposal would not cause material harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of No. 1 Logan Drive. It would not be contrary to Policy HO12 of the Stockton-on-Tees Local Plan (Local Plan), which requires, amongst other matters, for extensions to dwellings to avoid significant loss of amenity for the residents of neighbouring properties. It would also not conflict with the principles of the Supplementary Planning Guidance Note 2: Householder Extension Guide (SPG) or with Paragraph 17 of the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework), which requires, amongst other matters, a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupiers of land and buildings.

Character and Appearance

8. The appeal site is situated in a predominately residential area, which contains a mix of bungalows and two storey properties. The properties are constructed on broadly consistent building lines and are set back from the road, behind gardens and parking areas, which gives the area a pleasantly spacious character.
9. The proposed side extension would be set forward of the front elevation by around 2.5 metres and would have a glazed gable front. Whilst I acknowledge that gable projections can be found to the front of some bungalows in the area, and I was able to see some of these during my site visit, the width of this element of the development, as well as its forward projection would result in it having a significant mass and bulk. I note the comments the appellant makes on the guidance contained within the SPG, which is said to relate to dwellings of a similar form and that the appeal property is set back from a row of bungalows to the north. I was also able to see that there is some variety of built form in the local area. However, the appeal building does sit broadly in line with the adjacent dwelling at No. 24, which is also of a similar scale and form. For this reason, the forward extent of the development would be out of keeping with the neighbouring building and the open characteristics of the area.
10. I acknowledge that the appeal site sits in a large corner plot and that it would still retain some separation from properties to either side, and therefore would not give rise to a terracing effect. However, whilst this may be the case, I find that the bulk and the forward positioning of the extension would form an obtrusive feature in the streetscene.
11. I therefore conclude that the proposal would have an unacceptable adverse impact on the character and appearance of the area and would therefore be

contrary to Policy HO12 of the Local Plan and Policy CS3 of the Core Strategy Development Plan Document, which require, amongst other matters, that extensions to dwellings are in keeping with the property and the streetscene and the design makes a positive contribution to the local area. It would also be contrary to the SPG and the Framework at Paragraphs 17 and 56, which require good design.

Other Matter

12. The appellant has suggested amendments to the appeal application but I am required to determine the appeal before me on its own merits.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above and having considered all other matters raised, including the lack of objections to the proposal, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

F Rafiq

INSPECTOR