



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 August 2019 by Ifeanyi Chukwujekwu BSc MSc PIEMA RTPI (Assoc)

Decision by A U Ghafoor BSc (Hons) MA, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6 September 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/H0738/D/19/3231645
Hilton House, Yarm Road, Hilton, TS15 9LF

- 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 Craig Newson against the decision of Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 19/0178/FUL, dated 28 January 2019, was refused by notice dated 22 May 2019.
 - The development proposed is double garage with room in the roof space to create bedroom dormers front and rear.
-

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 upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. Hilton House is a large detached former farm house and it has been expanded via implementation of planning permission¹. It sits within a large plot with a landscaped boundary. Though partly screened by the hedge, it sits on an elevated position. The surrounding area is rural in character and the appeal property is prominent when seen from the Yarm Road. The village is a scattered settlement with a mix of agricultural and residential buildings. The distinctive character of the surrounding area is derived from irregular shaped buildings. These create an appearance of a non-linear or longitudinal building form.
5. The proposed extension by virtue of its scale and mass would be significant in floor area. It is nearly half the length of the original building, and therefore not considered to be subservient to the host dwelling. The proposal also introduces a half-hipped roof which is alien to the existing host dwelling. Contrary to the

¹ Council ref: 07/0746/FUL.

appellants argument, the insertion of dormer windows would make the roof even more incongruous with the host dwelling. Taken together, these would create an unbalanced appearance of the host dwelling. Additionally, the increased bulk and mass of the extension when set in line with the existing dwelling would create a linear form. The introduction of this linear form would result in an alien form of development. The contribution that the host dwelling makes to the appearance of the area would be significantly diminished as a result.

6. The overall built-form of the proposed extension would be visually harmful to the area's established irregular character. The appellant agrees that a linear form is typical of farm dwellings and in the vicinity of the appeal site there are linear and longitudinal designs. Nonetheless, irregular shaped dwellings are a distinctive feature of the area. The scheme would have a visually harmful effect on the countryside quality of the area given the overall design, scale and mass of the extension. The existence of other development is not a strong enough reason to justify visually harmful development.
7. The appellant refers to the existence of a fallback position having regard to permitted development (PD) rights. A single storey side extension or a two-storey rear extension under Part 1 (Class A) could be erected without express planning permission, but the appeal scheme would be plainly unacceptable given the mass and scale of the proposed two storey extension . Even if there is a realistic prospect of PD rights being exercised, this matter attracts limited weight.
8. I find that the development would significantly harm the visual appearance of the host dwelling and would be inconsistent with the established character of the area. Accordingly, there is conflict with the aims and objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework, Policies SD3 and SD8 of Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council's Local Plan (2019) and Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance Note 2 (Householder Extensions) (2004).

Conclusion and Recommendation

9. For the reasons given above and having had regard to evidence before me, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

Ifeanyi Chukwujekwu

APPEALS PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

10. 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