



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 August 2019 by Ifeanyi Chukwujekwu BSc (Hons) MSC PIEMA RTPI (Assoc)

Decision by A U Ghafoor BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 August 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/H0738/W/19/3229562

39 Dentedale Close, Yarm, TS15 9UJ

- 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 and Mrs Vince McFee against the decision of Council of Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 19/0003/FUL, dated 20 December 2018, was refused by notice dated 1 April 2019.
 - The development proposed is one-bedroom bungalow on garden land at 39 Dentedale, Yarm.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. No. 39 is a detached bungalow located at a cul-de-sac at the end of Dentedale Close. The surrounding area is residential, and the character of the street is derived mostly from two-storey detached dwellings with front amenity spaces and parking to the side. The end of the close however, is characterised by gable frontage bungalows.
5. The one-bedroom bungalow would be located on the grassed lawn with a mature conifer boundary hedge, within the curtilage of No. 39. This would result in the loss of the green area which is an important feature adding to the soft landscaped appearance of Dentedale Close. By virtue of being a corner plot, No. 39 benefits from this relatively large green amenity space which also provides a significant enhancement to the character of this part of the area. The loss of this visually pleasant green area would result in a cramped pattern of development detrimental to the appearance of the street scene.
6. Additionally, due to the constraints presented by the size of the garden, the proposal would represent an overdevelopment with significantly less open

amenity space compared to other dwellings. By virtue of the site constraints, the proposal would be located such that the elevation fronting the street would have a linear appearance. This is in contrast with other bungalows in the area which present gabled frontages. Contrary to the appellant's arguments, the hedge is not of a sufficient height to soften the visual impact of the proposed dwelling. It would appear prominent and represent an incongruous addition to the street scene.

7. It is contended that the Council has granted planning permission for large developments on greenfield. But details of such examples have not been presented. In any event, the green area reinforces the landscaped setting of the street and enhances its character. These other examples do not justify harmful development and each application and appeal should be determined on its individual merits.
8. The argument is that the proposal would provide additional sought-after affordable housing as compared to the type of housing available in the area, but the extent of the proposal would detract from the pattern of the area. The proposal would create an additional dwelling, but the design, siting and location of the proposed development would cause harm to the area's character and appearance.
9. Taking all the above points together, I find that the design, scale and layout of the proposed one-bedroom bungalow would harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The other considerations advanced do not outweigh the harm which would be caused by the proposal. Accordingly, there would be conflict with the aims and objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework and policy SD8 of Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council's Local Plan (2019).

Other Matters

10. The appellant has expressed dissatisfaction with the Council's handling of the application. This is not a matter to be determined in this appeal.

Conclusion and Recommendation

11. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

Ifeanyi Chukwujekwu

Appeals Planning Officer

Inspector's Decision

12. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report, and, on that basis, I too agree that the appeal should be dismissed.

A U Ghafoor

INSPECTOR