



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 February 2020

by Alison Partington BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 February 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/H0738/D/19/3242089

2 Potto Close, Yarm TS15 9RZ

- 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 Mrs Sarah Kane against the decision of Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 19/1345/FUL, dated 17 June 2019, was refused by notice dated 13 September 2019.
 - The development proposed is the erection of first floor extension to the front, alterations to the porch, installation of a bay window to the front and the erection of a single storey extension to the rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of first floor extension to the front, alterations to the porch, installation of a bay window to the front and the erection of a single storey extension to the rear at 2 Potto Close, Yarm TS15 9RZ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 19/1345/FUL, dated 17 June 2019, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Site Location Plan Scale 1:1250; Existing Plans and Elevations Drawing Number 2019/SK/01; Existing and Proposed Plans and Elevations Drawing Number 2019/SK/02; Proposed Plans and Elevations Drawing Number 2019/SK/03.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of development used in the banner heading above and the formal decision is taken from the decision notice and the appeal form as this gives a more accurate description of the totality of the works proposed than the description given on the application form.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in the appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a detached house in a small cul-de-sac. The surrounding area is residential, comprising a mix of bungalows and houses of varying designs but of a similar age, many of which have been extended in a variety of ways. The appeal dwelling has previously been extended at the front and has converted the garage to living accommodation. As such, it has a projecting single storey element at the front that extends the full width of the house, part of which has a flat roof and part of which has a pitch roof.
5. As well as a small single storey rear extension, it is proposed to create a first floor extension over the existing single storey element at the front. This would have a double gable feature with the central element over the porch not projecting as far forwards.
6. I observed that many of the dwellings in the area, including some in the cul-de-sac, are gable ended properties. As such, the gable features on the proposed extension would not appear out of character with the surrounding housing. To this end I note that the existing gable feature at ground floor level is not detrimental to the character and appearance of the area. Moreover, the appellant has highlighted that the property has an extant planning permission¹ for a smaller first floor front extension with a gable feature. In approving this it was clearly considered that a gable feature would be a sympathetic addition to the host property and the street scene. Given this I am not persuaded that two rather than one gable element would have an unacceptable impact on the street scene.
7. Although extending the full width of the property, the ridge height of the extension would remain below that of the main dwelling, and so the extension would be a subservient addition. I note that the Council's guidance indicates that front extensions, other than porches, are not normally acceptable. However, the scale and mass of the host property is such that the extension would not be an overly dominant feature. In addition, as it would be built above the existing ground floor element, it would not extend the building line, especially as No 4 has a first floor extension at the front that projects a similar distance. Thus, I am satisfied that the extension would not be an obtrusive addition to the street scene and would respect the proportions of the host property.
8. The Council indicated that they consider the rear extension could be carried out under permitted development rights. Be that as it may, it forms part of the scheme before me. This extension would be modest in size and as it would not be visible from the road it would have no impact on the street scene.
9. Overall, I consider that the proposal would not have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the area. Accordingly, there would be no conflict with policies SD3 and SD8 of the *Stockton-on-Tees Local Plan (adopted January 2019)* which requires that developments in general, and domestic extensions specifically, have a high quality of design that respond positively to the local character and are in keeping with the host property and the street

¹ Application Reference 17/1812/FUL

scene. Nor would it conflict with the *National Planning Policy Framework* which also requires that developments are sympathetic to the local character.

10. In addition to the standard implementation condition, to provide certainty it is necessary to define the plans with which the scheme should accord. In the interests of the character and appearance of the area a condition is required to control the external appearance of the extensions.

Alison Partington

INSPECTOR