



## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 February 2021

**by David Cross BA(Hons) PgDip(Dist) TechIOA MRTPI**

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

**Decision date: 4 March 2021**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/H0738/D/20/3264141**

**Aranvale, Sandy Lane West, Billingham TS22 5NB**

- 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 Ian Richardson against the decision of Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council.
  - The application Ref 20/1982/FUL, dated 12 September 2020, was refused by notice dated 4 November 2020.
  - The development proposed is single storey side extension.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling.

### Reasons

3. The appeal site consists of a modest bungalow set within a large plot in a rural area. The bungalow has some minor additions including a side extension and a rear dormer, and the plot includes a number of outbuildings of various sizes. The site is located out with the defined limits to development and is therefore considered to be in the countryside for the purposes of planning policy. Policy SD3 of the Council's Local Plan 2019 (the Local Plan) sets out that support will be given to extensions to dwellings in the countryside which are of a suitable scale and subservient to the host dwelling.
4. The proposed extension to the side would effectively double the width of the bungalow. Due to the scale and design of the proposal in comparison to the existing dwelling, this would result in a building of an incongruous elongated appearance. Although the extension would be set back from the front elevation and be lower than the bungalow's ridge height, these factors would not mitigate for the awkward appearance of the resultant building. Whilst the host building may not be symmetrical, this does not justify the excessive projection of the proposed extension to the side. The use of a hipped roof on the extension would also do little to overcome its incongruous appearance.
5. There is no defined building style in the area, and as a free-standing building in a large plot then it may be possible to introduce significant extensions or additions which would be of an acceptable appearance. This reflects the

conclusions of the Inspector in the Barrowby appeal decision provided by the appellant, although I have not been provided with full details of that scheme and so cannot be certain it represents a direct parallel to the appeal before me. In any event I have determined this appeal on its own merits and I do not consider that the proposed extension would be of an acceptable design. When viewed as a whole, the extended building would appear as an awkward and contrived addition to the area. Furthermore, even allowing for the set-back and the lower ridge height, the proposed extension would not be subservient to the host dwelling due to its excessive length.

6. A degree of screening would be provided by boundary treatment and planting. However, I consider that the unacceptable appearance of the extension would still be apparent in views from the surrounding area, especially when the planting is not in leaf as was the case at the time of my visit.
7. The proposal may make more efficient use of the site and it would provide increased living space, however it may also be possible to achieve these benefits through extensions or alterations of a more appropriate design. These considerations therefore carry little weight in favour of the design and scale of the appeal proposal. The lack of impact on neighbouring land uses is a neutral factor and would not mitigate for the harm arising in respect of character and appearance.
8. I conclude that due to its scale and design, the proposal would lead to significant harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling. The proposal would therefore be contrary to policies SD3 and SD8 of the Local Plan in respect of scale and design. The proposal would also conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework in respect of achieving well-designed places. The proposal would also not comply with the advice of the Council's Householder Extension Guide 2004 with regards to the design and scale of extensions.
9. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*David Cross*

INSPECTOR