



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 February 2020

**by Mark Harbottle BSc MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 20<sup>th</sup> March 2020**

---

### **Appeal Ref: APP/H0738/D/20/3245023**

### **Ouston Moor Hall, Darlington Back Lane, Stockton-on-Tees TS21 1BB**

- 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 Mrs Frances Connolly against the decision of Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council.
  - The application Ref 19/1323/FUL, dated 12 June 2019, was refused by notice dated 28 October 2019.
  - The development proposed is a side entrance extension.
- 

### **Decision**

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a side entrance extension at Ouston Moor Hall, Darlington Back Lane, Stockton-on-Tees TS21 1BB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 19/1323/FUL, dated 12 June 2019, subject to the following conditions:
  - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
  - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved drawings Nos 001, 002, 003, 004 and SBC0001.
  - 3) No part of the development above ground level shall be constructed until details / samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details / samples.

### **Main Issue**

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of Ouston Moor Hall.

### **Reasons**

3. The Hall is a substantial Victorian house, set back from the road within extensive grounds and accessed by a long curving driveway. It has been enlarged over the years, most noticeably by a linked single storey extension with a large footprint visible from the road.
4. Under Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council Local Plan policy HE2, where the Council identifies that a building has significance because of its heritage interest, it will be considered a heritage asset. The Council has decided the Hall is a non-designated heritage asset owing to its well preserved original

architectural details, which therefore define its heritage significance, and I agree with that position. The policy also requires development to conserve and enhance heritage assets and their settings in a manner appropriate to their significance. Paragraph 197 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) requires the effect of development on the significance of non-designated heritage assets to be considered in decisions.

5. The Council places value on the architectural detailing of the current porch, although I note the appellant's view that it may be demolished without permission. While I agree the porch has architectural merit, it differs from the original building in respect of the detailing and some of the materials used. Those differences lead me to conclude that the porch is a later addition which, by definition, cannot contain original architectural details that form the basis of the Hall's heritage significance.
6. Both parties describe the proposed extension as a porch and agree it is acceptable in principle and scale. The Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance Note 2, Householder Extension Guide, expects porches to be in keeping with the design and form of the existing house, including the pitch of the roof. However, it refers to porches under the heading "front extension" and this porch would not be attached to a part of the building readily recognisable as the front. The Hall already has a flat roofed element and I have been given evidence that flat roof porticos are relatively common to Victorian buildings, albeit those of a grander design.
7. The current porch illustrates that the materials and detailing of later additions may not necessarily closely reflect earlier parts of the building and, as already noted, the heritage significance of the Hall lies in its original architectural details. The proposed extension would not alter those details and, having considered all the evidence, I am satisfied that its style and proportion would be in keeping with the Hall and appropriate to its heritage significance. Subject to details of materials, which can be secured by condition, it would respond positively to the quality, character and sensitivity of the heritage asset and avoid harm to its significance.
8. For these reasons I find the proposal to be in accordance with Local Plan policies HE2, SD3 and SD8 and Part 16 of the Framework. Consequently, the appeal is allowed.

*Mark Harbottle*

INSPECTOR