



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 April 2025

**by M J Francis BA (Hons) MA MSc MCIfA**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

**Decision date: 29 May 2025**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/H0738/D/25/3360879**

**8 Priorwood Gardens, Ingleby Barwick, Stockton-on-Tees TS17 0XH**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
  - The appeal is made by Mr M Ford against the decision of Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council.
  - The application Ref is 23/2216/FUL.
  - The development proposed is attic conversion to include raising of the roof. Front and rear single storey extensions and conversion of garage.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Applications for costs

2. An application for an award of costs has been submitted by Mr M Ford which is the subject of a separate decision.

### Preliminary Matters

3. Whilst the application was refused in part because of the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the dwelling and the area, there is no dispute between the main parties regarding the single storey extensions and conversion of the garage. This is the basis on which I have determined the appeal.

### Main Issues

4. The main issues are:
  - the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area; and
  - whether the proposal would provide acceptable living conditions for the occupiers of No 10 Priorwood Gardens (No 10) with regards to privacy and outlook.

### Reasons

#### *Character and appearance*

5. The appeal property is a modern, detached, two-storey dwelling on a residential estate of mainly detached houses. It is constructed of brick with some render and an extended gable feature at 1<sup>st</sup> floor level, with a tiled, pitched roof. Next to the house is a detached, single storey, double garage, with a hipped roof and a driveway. The site has a garden to the front and rear. On the other side of the

house is a single garage with a pitched roof and tarmac driveway, owned by No 10, a detached bungalow.

6. The appellant contends that allowing an increase in the height of No 4 Priorwood Gardens, (No 4)<sup>1</sup>, with a roof pitch of 42°, including dormer windows to front and rear, set a precedent. However, Priorwood Gardens slopes downwards from the junction with Beckfields Avenue, and No 4, sited between two dwellings with front gable elevations, does not appear out of scale with the existing streetscape.
7. I saw the variety of designs and scale of properties in the vicinity of No 8, including the differing roof heights, as well as the gable elevation of No 2 Strome Close, opposite the site. However, the proposal would increase the ridge height of the house by 2.4 metres so that the apex would be 9.5 metres in height and include the enlargement of the front gable projection. This would change the current roof pitch of 25° to 45°. Whilst the proposal would provide additional floor space in the roof and would not satisfy building regulations if the height was reduced, the increase and overall height would appear to be much greater than found in other properties nearby.
8. The appeal site is downslope and at the end of a row of four detached properties, (Nos 2-8), close to the corner of Priorwood Gardens. The corner plot is occupied by No 10 which has an extensive front garden, whose sweeping lawn extends from the front to the side and follows the curve of the road. However, as No 10 is set well back from the road, No 8's side elevation is highly visible within the adjoining area.
9. Consequently, raising the height of the property by 2.4 metres would result in an increase in the massing of the enlarged gable elevation. Whilst the small garage at No 10 visually breaks up the side elevation of No 8 and is closer to the bungalow than the proposed development, the proposal would be overly dominant in this prominent corner location. Moreover, and notwithstanding the height of other houses in the vicinity, it would be out of scale and character to surrounding properties.
10. Furthermore, when viewed from the front, the proposed roofscape of No 8 would appear oversized and bulky. Whilst the gable feature would, in part, break this up, this is much larger than the existing feature. Although rooflights, rather than dormers, have been proposed, the steep pitch, seemingly steeper than properties nearby, would harm the appearance of the house and appear incongruous in this location.
11. I therefore conclude that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. It would conflict with Policies SD3 and SD8 of the Stockton-on-Tees Local Plan, 2019 (LP). These policies support domestic extensions where they are in keeping with the property and appropriate to the surrounding area, including in terms of style and proportion.

#### *Living conditions of No 10*

12. The bungalow at No 10 is positioned at right-angles to the side elevation of No 8. However, the differences in adjoining land levels means that the bungalow is sited

---

<sup>1</sup> Ref 20/1663/FUL

much lower than No 8 and its rear garden. To overcome the changes in levels, the rear garden of No 10 has been terraced.

13. Whilst the proposed development would not result in any overlooking of the rear of the bungalow or garden, and affect their privacy, the increase in height of No 8 by 2.4 metres would be apparent and appear overbearing to the occupiers of No 10, particularly when sitting in their conservatory, which is located on the side elevation, or using the adjoining patio and garden.
14. The main parties refer to the proposal being between 11 and 11.7 metres from the rear elevation of No 10. Whilst this distance may technically accord with the Council's Householder Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document, 2021 (SPD), and there are no windows on the proposed side elevation of No 8, the SPD does state that these distances will increase if there is a variation in ground levels between the properties or a difference in the number of storeys. No 10 is a bungalow, adjoining, and at a lower level than a two-storey house. Consequently, this increase in height would be more acute and appear dominant at the rear of No 10. This would harm the outlook of the occupiers.
15. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would result in moderate harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of No 10 with regards to outlook. It would conflict with LP Policies SD3 and SD8 which together requires new development to not harm the amenity of residents of neighbouring properties.

### **Other Matters**

16. The proposed development would not result in any flood risk, or other environmental and ecological concerns. Whilst it would provide some economic benefits during the construction of the proposal, these would be limited and would not outweigh the other concerns that I have identified.

### **Conclusion**

17. The proposed development conflicts with the development plan when considered as a whole and there are no material considerations, including the National Planning Policy Framework, that outweigh the identified harm and associated development plan conflict.
18. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal is dismissed.

*M J Francis*

INSPECTOR