



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 December 2019

by J Hunter BA (Hons) Msc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12th December 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/V0728/D/19/3236456

Brown House, Stokesley Road, Guisborough, TS14 8DL

- 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 G Wild against the decision of Redcar & Cleveland Borough Council.
 - The application Ref R/2019/0187/FF, dated 25 March 2019, was refused by notice dated 12 July 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as proposed pitch roof and dormer extension to existing garage to form games room.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring property Oak House with particular reference to outlook.

Reasons

3. The host property is a substantial detached house in a spacious verdant plot within an established residential area. The appeal proposes alterations to an existing detached double garage to the rear of the host property, on the shared boundary with Oak House.
4. Oak House sits perpendicular to the host property and has a relatively modest outdoor amenity space which runs alongside the rear elevation of the garage. At present the garage is relatively inconspicuous as it has a flat roof and is set back approximately 750 millimetres from an existing boundary fence that is approximately 1.8 metres in height. Both side elevations of the garage are flanked by tall planting which further screen the garage from view.
5. Policy SD4 of the Redcar & Cleveland Local Plan 2018 (LP) sets out the general development principles to be used when assessing the suitability of a site, location or development stating that development will be permitted where it, amongst other things, will not have a significant adverse impact on the amenities of occupiers of existing or proposed nearby land and buildings.
6. The proposal would see the replacement of the existing flat roof with a pitched roof and the insertion of dormer windows to the front elevation facing towards

the host property. In addition, there would be internal alterations to enable the building's use as a games room. There would be no first-floor windows on the rear elevation of the garage. This, together with the existing boundary fence would ensure that the scheme would not cause overlooking of or loss of privacy to the occupiers of Oak House

7. However, the proposed alterations would significantly increase the overall height of the existing garage from approximately 2.7 metres to 5.5 metres. Whilst I do appreciate that there is a slight set back from the shared boundary and there will be no openings which overlook the neighbouring property, I consider that the proposed alterations and in particular the increased ridge height, would introduce a bulky and incongruous addition, that would, due to its scale, create a dominant and oppressive feature which would have an overbearing effect upon outlook from both the back garden and the rear facing habitable rooms of Oak House.
8. Consequently, I consider that the proposal would have a significantly harmful effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of Oak House with particular reference to outlook. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy SD4 of the LP.

Other Matters

9. The appellant has referenced the presence of trees within the immediate area and he submits that they already cast shade on the garden areas. Whilst I accept that due to the orientation of the properties there may be some shading from the trees, it does not justify further harm, nor does it alter my findings on the main issue.
10. The appellant has provided photographs of other detached garages within the vicinity of the appeal site. However, I do not have the full details of these developments or the circumstances under which they were approved and therefore I cannot assess the similarities. Nonetheless, I must determine this appeal on its own merits.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons outlined above and taking into account all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

J. Hunter

INSPECTOR