
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 October 2017

by Elaine Gray MA(Hons) MSc IHBC

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

Decision date: 17 November 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/V0728/D/17/3180890

33 Lindrick Road, New Marske TS11 8HT

- 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 D Wheeler against the decision of Redcar & Cleveland Borough Council.
 - The application Ref R/2017/0203/FF, dated 9 February 2017, was refused by notice dated 15 June 2017.
 - The development proposed is conversion of garage to granny annex and new attached garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a two storey detached dwelling located in a predominantly residential area. The proposal would create a granny annex, and a new garage within a single storey side extension.
4. The Council's document entitled 'Redcar & Cleveland Local Development Framework - Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD' (SPD) sets out guidelines for side extensions within corner plots. It advises that a distance of not less than 3m should be left between the building and the back edge of the footpath, in order to maintain the openness of corner sites.
5. I accept that the design and proposed materials of the new garage extension would reflect the appearance of the appeal site, and that the extension would be subservient in scale to the main building. However, the development would extend to approximately 0.75m from the pavement edge, which would be significantly less than the recommended 3m.
6. The size of the existing garden at No 33 is typical of the suburban layout of the area, which is particularly characterised by more generous plots on corners adjacent to junctions. The appeal site adjoins Coxmoor Way, and the garden plot of No 33 adds to the more open, spacious appearance at the junction. I noted a similar area of separation between Coxmoor Way and the neighbouring

- property at 31 Lindrick Road, and this pattern of development is repeated at other corner properties in the area.
7. By infilling the space at the side of No 33, and bringing the built form significantly closer to the pavement, the proposed side extension would substantially reduce the open character of the corner plot. It would appear cramped within site, and would be significantly at odds with the prevailing pattern of development that I have noted above. I therefore find that the proposal would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
 8. The appellant makes reference to the elevation of the site and the existing fence. However, much of the new development would be visible above the fence in views towards the side of the property. It would also be clearly visible from the public realm to the front of No 33. The slight elevation of the site in relation to the surrounding land would serve to increase its visual prominence in the area.
 9. I therefore conclude that the proposal would be contrary to the aims of Policy CS20 of the Redcar and Cleveland Local Development Framework Core Strategy DPD, insofar as it requires development to respect or enhance the character of the local area, and Policies DP2 and DP3 of the Redcar and Cleveland Local Development Framework Development Policies DPD, which amongst other things, seek to minimise any adverse impact on the overall character of the streetscape, and to contribute to a sense of place and quality. It would conflict with the principles set out in the SPD, and also with the National Planning Policy Framework, which seeks to secure high quality design.
 10. I acknowledge the personal circumstances of the appellant, and the benefit to them of accommodating an elderly family member within a secure environment. However, I can give this circumstance little weight in planning terms. I accept that the development would preserve the living conditions of neighbours, and that no representations have been received objecting to the proposal. I note also that the construction techniques would promote sustainability, and that facilities within the house would be improved. However, these circumstances have not led me to a different conclusion on the main issue.
 11. For the reasons above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Elaine Gray

INSPECTOR