



# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 May 2017

by **David Cross BA (Hons), PGDip, MRTPI**

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

Decision date: 14 June 2017

---

## Appeal Ref: **APP/H0738/D/17/3170657**

### **11 The Rigg, Yarm TS15 9XA**

- 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 Richard Attwood against the decision of Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council.
  - The application Ref 16/3017/FUL, dated 22 November 2016, was refused by notice dated 31 January 2017.
  - The development proposed is demolition of existing attached garage and front porch. Construction of a two storey side/front extension and construction of a front porch.
- 

### **Decision**

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### **Main Issue**

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the existing building and the street scene.

### **Reasons**

3. The appeal property is a detached dwelling of an understated modern appearance located at the head of a cul-de-sac. I saw that there is some variety in the design of dwellings in the area, and that properties on The Rigg are staggered back from the highway, particularly on the northern side of the cul-de-sac leading up to the appeal site.
4. The proposal consists of a two-storey extension to the side of the dwelling which would also include a gable extension projecting forward of the main front wall of the dwelling by approximately 4m. The resulting form, scale and mass of the extension would not be subservient to the host dwelling, as the front extension in particular would dominate the frontage and would appear as an overdominant extension projecting a significant distance beyond the main front elevation. The proposed side extension would also continue the main ridge line of the property which would exacerbate the overdominant appearance of the proposal.
5. In support of the proposal, the appellant refers to an existing porch and garage which extend to the front of the dwelling by approximately 1m. He also refers to a proposed porch which would extend to the front by approximately 2m. However, these features are/would be located at ground floor level and would not ameliorate or provide a contextual justification for a two-storey front extension of the scale and massing of the proposal.

- 
6. Dwellings to the north of cul-de-sac are staggered back from the highway. Therefore there is not a well-defined building line leading up to the appeal site and the proposal would not lead to a potential 'terracing effect' with adjacent properties. However, this context would not overcome the incongruous appearance of the proposal, which would be an obtrusive and overdominant extension projecting to the front of an existing dwelling rather than an integral element of the street scene. The location of the site at the end of the cul-de-sac would add to this visual intrusion as the flank wall of the extension to the front would be readily visible on entering the cul-de-sac.
  7. I appreciate that the extension has been designed to make use of the front garden of the property and maximise amenity space to the rear. I am also mindful of the personal circumstances of the appellant and his wish to accommodate his growing family. I also note that no objections have been received from nearby residents or technical consultees. However, these matters do not provide strong justification for the extension and they do not outweigh the harm to character and appearance that I have identified above.
  8. I conclude that, due to its scale and massing, the proposed extension would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene. The proposal is therefore contrary to Saved Policy HO12 of the Stockton-on-Tees Local Plan 1997 in respect of being in keeping with the property and the street scene. The proposal would also conflict with Policy CS3(8) of the Stockton-on-Tees Core Strategy 2010 in respect of protecting or enhancing local character. These policies broadly comply with the core planning principles of the National Planning Policy Framework with regards to securing high quality design. The proposal would also be contrary to the Supplementary Planning Guidance 2 (Householder Extensions)<sup>1</sup> which advises that front extensions are not normally appropriate, unless there is strong justification.
  9. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*David Cross*

INSPECTOR

---

<sup>1</sup> Supplementary Planning Guidance Note 2: Householder Extension Guide, 2004