



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 November 2018

by **E Symmons BSc (Hons) MSc MArborA**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 07 December 2018

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/H0738/D/18/3211863**  
**72 Wetherall Avenue, Yarm TS15 9TP.**

- 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 Colin Klish against the decision of Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council.
  - The application ref 18/1483/FUL, dated 25 June 2018, was refused by notice dated 24 August 2018.
  - The development proposed is an extension above the garage at the front of the dwelling.
- 

### Decision

1. This appeal is dismissed

### Main Issue

2. The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

### Reasons

3. This brick-built, two-storey detached house sits within a residential area. The properties in the street all have pitched roofs with gable ends; however, their orientation varies. Some are gable wall towards the street whilst others, including the appeal property, sit with the roof slope to the front. The front building line of the houses is somewhat staggered. The porch and garage project forward of the front elevation having a short sloping roof above: this detail is characteristic of houses in the street. There is an existing first floor extension situated above the garage which is flush with the main front wall.
4. The Council's supplementary Planning Guidance Note 2 - the Householder Extension Guide<sup>1</sup> (SPD2) requires extensions to 'blend' with the dwelling and wider street scene. Paragraph 4.1 goes on to say that front extensions are not usually permitted due to their effect on the character of the property and of the building line. This proposal would bring the front elevation forward over the existing garage projection forming a two-storey extension to the front. During my site visit I did not observe any similar front extensions in the vicinity. On approach from Davenport Road, the extension would be clearly visible projecting from the front of the property. As the property sits opposite the junction with Garsdale Close, it would also be visible from this aspect.

---

<sup>1</sup> February 2004.

5. Although the front building line is staggered this would not mitigate the size and projection of the proposed extension. The extension seeks to replicate the front gable wall design of the adjacent properties. However, this would not mitigate the appearance of the extension; rather, it would create a gable feature within a sloping roof outline, which is not characteristic of this property style.
6. Due to the two-storey nature of the extension, the resultant mass would form an overly dominant and incongruous feature in relation to the host property. This would harm the character and appearance of both the host property and the surrounding area. The proposal would therefore be contrary to the Council's Core Strategy Development Plan Document<sup>2</sup> Policy CS3, saved Local Plan Policy<sup>3</sup> HO12 and paragraphs 127 and 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework<sup>4</sup>. These policies, collectively, amongst other matters, require development proposals to be sympathetic to, and make a positive contribution to the local area.

### **Conclusions**

7. For the reasons detailed above, and having regard to other matters raised, I dismiss this appeal.

*E Symmons*

INSPECTOR

---

<sup>2</sup> 24 March 2010.

<sup>3</sup> 31 August 2007.

<sup>4</sup> July 2018.