

---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 April 2017

**by C L Humphrey BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government**

**Decision date: 5<sup>th</sup> May 2017**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/V0728/D/17/3171217**  
**18 Ascot Road, Redcar TS10 2HS**

- 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 and Mrs Williams against the decision of Redcar & Cleveland Borough Council.
  - The application Ref R/2016/0718/RS, dated 13 June 2016, was refused by notice dated 10 January 2017.
  - The development proposed is described as 'Proposed two storey side extension and garage'.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to the two storey side extension and single storey rear extension. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to the garage and planning permission is granted for a garage at 18 Ascot Road, Redcar TS10 2HS in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref R/2016/0718/RS, dated 13 June 2016, and the plans submitted with it, so far as relevant to that part of the development hereby permitted, and 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 following approved plans: Location Plan 1:1250, Site Plan 1:500, Proposed Plans and Elevations Drawing 03.
  - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the garage hereby permitted shall match those used in the main house at 18 Ascot Road.

### Procedural Matter

2. Notwithstanding the description of development set out in the banner heading above, which is taken from the application form, it is evident from the submitted drawings that the proposed development also includes a single storey rear extension. The Council's decision notice describes the proposed development as 'two storey extension at side, single storey rear extension and garage', and the appellant has used this description on the appeal form. This revised description of development more appropriately describes the proposed development. I have therefore considered the appeal on that basis as neither of the parties would be prejudiced or caused any injustice by me taking this course of action.
-

## **Main Issues**

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposed two storey side extension upon the character and appearance of the appeal property and the surrounding area, and the effect of the proposed single storey rear extension upon the living conditions of the occupants of the adjoining house at 16 Ascot Road with particular regard to outlook and sense of enclosure.

## **Reasons**

### *Character and appearance*

4. The appeal property is one of a pair of modest semi-detached houses situated on a prominent corner at the junction of Ascot Road and Sandown Park. Although of differing designs, the 4 houses set at each corner of the east-west section of Sandown Park are all characterised by the generous set back from their respective side boundaries at first floor level. This, together with the wide landscaped grass verge on both sides of the road, gives the street an attractive open, leafy quality.
5. The proposed side extension would be 2 storeys high. It would increase the width of the house by more than 50%, and would extend the full depth of the house finishing flush with the rear elevation of the existing offshoot. The eaves at the front and side of the extension would align with those of the existing house, and the main roof would be extended with a continuous ridgeline. As a result of its substantial width, the ridge of the projecting rear element of the extension would be considerably higher than that of the existing offshoot.
6. Due to its siting, scale and detailed design the proposed two storey side extension would result in a bulky addition that would not appear subordinate to the existing house. Furthermore, at first floor level, it would extend significantly beyond the established building line along the north side of Sandown Park, eroding the characteristic spacing to the side of the property. Consequently, the two storey side extension would create an unduly dominant and incongruous feature on this prominent corner plot.
7. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed two storey side extension would have a harmful effect upon the character and appearance of the appeal property and the surrounding area. As such, it would fail to accord with the design aims of Policy CS20 of the Redcar & Cleveland Core Strategy Development Plan Document (the Core Strategy), Policies DP2 and DP3 of the Redcar & Cleveland Development Policies Development Plan Document (the DPDPD), the Redcar & Cleveland Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (the REASPD) and the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks to reinforce local distinctiveness.

### *Living conditions*

8. The proposed single storey rear extension would be constructed of brick and tile. It would project just over 4 metres along the boundary with the adjoining house at No 16, and the mono-pitched roof would terminate immediately below the first floor bedroom window. No 16 has glazed openings at ground floor level in both the main rear elevation and the side of the offshoot facing towards the appeal property. Due to its siting, considerable height and projection and solid form, the proposed rear extension would have a significant enclosing and

overbearing effect which would be harmful to outlook from the windows and garden of the adjoining house.

9. I note that the neighbours at No 16 have not objected to the proposed development. However, the absence of objection does not in itself render the scheme acceptable and I must determine the appeal with regard to the planning merits of the case. Accordingly, I have given this matter little weight.
10. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the proposed single storey rear extension would have a harmful effect upon the living conditions of the occupants of the adjoining house at 16 Ascot Road with particular regard to outlook and sense of enclosure. As such, it would fail to accord with the amenity protection aims of Policy CS20 of the Core Strategy, Policies DP2 and DP3 of the DPD and the REASPD.

#### *Other matters*

11. The proposed garage would replace an existing L-shaped detached garage at the western end of the back garden, and would be of brick and tile construction in keeping with surrounding development. This part of the appeal proposal is clearly severable from the other elements of the proposed development both physically and functionally. The Council's delegated report states that the proposed garage is acceptable in itself. Based upon the evidence before me and my observations on site, I have no reason to take a different view. I therefore conclude that the proposed garage would accord with the design and amenity protection aims of Policy CS20 of the Core Strategy, Policies DP2 and DP3 of the DPD and the REASPD.

#### **Conditions**

12. I have imposed a condition specifying the relevant drawings as this provides certainty. In order to safeguard the character and appearance of the area, I have imposed a condition relating to the materials to be used in the construction of the garage.

#### **Conclusion**

13. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, including the needs of the appellants' family, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed insofar as it relates to the two storey side extension and single storey rear extension and allowed insofar as it relates to the garage.

*CL Humphrey*

INSPECTOR