



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 March 2022

by Richard Newsome BA (Hons) MTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 04 April 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/H0738/D/22/3290195

58 Dunelm Road, Stockton-on-Tees TS19 0TS

- 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 Andy Macdonald against the decision of Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/2545/FUL, dated 30 September 2021, was refused by notice dated 3 December 2021.
 - The development proposed is erection of two storey extension to rear, single storey mono-pitched extension to front and erection of chimney to side (Re-submission).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue raised by this appeal is the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a 2-storey detached brick-faced dwelling in a predominantly residential area. There are a variety of property styles and types near the appeal property, including stepped front projections. There is a staggered building line to the row of dwellings that the appeal property forms part of.
4. The external materials and roof slope of the front extension would match the existing dwelling. Nevertheless, the front extension would be a substantial addition across a large proportion of the frontage of the dwelling and would protrude significantly from its existing front elevations. Despite being set back from the highway, even if I were to agree that it would not break the staggered building line, the scale of the front extension would be obvious on the approaches to the site and from nearby properties.
5. Whilst there are existing front projections to other properties nearby these are of different depths, shapes, roof styles, or related to bungalows and are not directly comparable to the proposal. Notwithstanding this, one commonality of the other front projections is that none are as substantial or pronounced as that which the proposal would result in.
6. I appreciate that the Council's Householder Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (2021) (the SPD) states that '*Front extensions are more likely to be appropriate if a dwelling is of an individual design or there is a staggered or indistinct building line.*'. However, it also

states that they should still match the design features of the original property and avoid being obtrusive, which I find the proposal would be in the context of the host dwelling and the immediate street scene by virtue of its scale and mass.

7. As a result, the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. It would therefore be contrary to the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework, Policies SD3 and SD8 of the Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council Local Plan (2019), and the principles of the SPD. Taken together these, amongst other things, require that development should be designed to the highest possible standard taking into consideration the context of the surrounding area and that extensions should be in keeping with the property and street scene in terms of style, proportion, and materials.

Other Matters

8. I acknowledge that there is local support for the proposal from some residents of dwellings in the immediate vicinity of the appeal property. However, support for a scheme by third parties is not a reason in itself to allow a proposal that is unacceptable.
9. Whilst the appellant has sought to overcome the reasons for the refusal of the previous scheme, I have found that the proposal before me would result in harm. The alternative scheme put forward by the appellant does not form part of this appeal and its merits are not for me to consider.
10. I appreciate that the proposal would provide better living accommodation for the appellant's growing family. However, this personal benefit would not outweigh the harm that would arise to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area as a result of the proposal.
11. I accept that sufficient parking would be provided as part of the proposal. However, this is a neutral factor and has not affected my determination of the appeal.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, having considered the development plan as a whole, and all other relevant material considerations, the appeal should be dismissed.

Richard Newsome

INSPECTOR