



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 July 2020 by S Witherley

Decision by Chris Preston BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 August 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/V0728/D/20/3249310

137 Churchill Drive, Marske By The Sea TS11 6BG

- 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 & Mrs J Glass against the decision of Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council.
 - The application, Ref R/2019/0726/FF, dated 25 November 2019, was refused by notice 27 February 2020.
 - The development proposed as described on the application form is: Proposed two storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two storey side and single storey front extension at 137 Churchill Drive, Marske By The Sea TS11 6BG, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref R/2019/0726/FF, dated 25 November 2019, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) This development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with approved plans, site and location plan 003, Proposed elevations 002 B.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matter

3. The description of development was altered by the Council to include reference to a single storey front extension. In my view this more accurately describes the proposal and I shall therefore use it in the formal decision above.
 4. The date of the Councils decision notice predates the application validation date. The date has therefore been taken from the appeal form and used in the banner header above.
 5. At the time of my site visit a two-storey side extension was under construction.
-

Main Issue

6. The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

7. No. 137 is a two-storey semi-detached property with attached single storey garage. The street scene is a mixture of two storey and single storey dwellings, with a number of alterations present. The appeal site is a corner plot fronting Churchill Drive with the flank wall set back from the common boundary overlooking Bladon Drive. I noted similar corner plots with properties set back from the side boundary and this presented a sense of openness which contributes positively to the character of the area.
8. The proposal seeks to remove the existing single storey flat roof garage and replace it with a two-storey extension covering the entire flank wall of the main dwelling, its roof flush with the main roof. The ground floor element would include a garage which would project forward of the front elevation with a mono pitched canopy over its opening and incorporating a front porch.
9. The Redcar & Cleveland Local Development Framework *Residential Extensions and Alterations* SPD (2013) (SPD) seeks two storey side extensions on corner plots to appear proportionate and subordinate to the main dwelling and retain a gap of at least 3 metres between the site and the public realm.
10. The Council consider that the side extension would result in a development greater than half the width of the existing two storey dwelling, however, they also accept that this does not take account of the existing single storey garage. It is clear from the drawings and what I observed on site that the single storey garage is an integral part of the existing dwelling. Therefore, whilst the proposal would see the existing single storey garage removed and the proposal built over and above this, I consider that the overall footprint of the development would not result in a development greater than half the width of the original dwelling.
11. Despite the proposal's overall size, particularly as it would create a second floor where previously there was only a single storey flat roof garage, it would not appear overly dominant or overbearing in the streetscape, nor would it create an imbalance between the main dwelling and that of the adjoining neighbour particularly as the front façade would be broken up by the proposed mono pitched canopy across part of the front elevation. In addition, the street comprises a mix of dwelling types and, in that context, the fact that the property would not mirror the precise appearance of its neighbour would not be unusual or harmful.
12. Whilst the gap between the proposed extension and the common boundary would reduce, this is considered minimal and there would remain sufficient spacing between the proposals flank wall and the back pavement to ensure that the proposal did not appear cramped in its visual context, thereby retaining a sense of openness on this corner.
13. Whilst it is accepted that the reduction in gap would not comply with the guidance as contained in the SPD, it is recognised that consideration of this guidance must be given to site specific circumstances. Therefore, having regard to the above findings and additionally to the overall scale of the existing

plot and the retention of the gap between the common boundary with No. 137, the proposed width along with the overall design, domestic scale and form of the proposed extension would not appear overly excessive or discordant against the original property or when viewed in the context of the pair of semi-detached properties or wider streetscape. The proposal would not, therefore, undermine the character of the street or the appeal property itself and high standards of urban design would be achieved, accordingly, the general design guidance and objectives of the SPD are met.

14. The Council are also concerned that the proposal would break up the existing building line to the north of the site, however, given that the proposal would extend out marginally from the existing building line of the existing single storey garage I do not consider that this would be detrimental to the character of the streetscape.
15. Overall I consider that the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area. It would thus comply with Policy SD4 of the Redcar and Cleveland Local Plan (2018) which seeks development to respect or enhance the character of the site and its surroundings in terms of its design features and is therefore consistent with the aims of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Other matters

16. An objection was raised by a neighbouring resident regarding the size of the proposal and its impact on the character and appearance of the street, matters of which I have addressed above.
17. In regards to precedent, each application and appeal are considered on their own individual merits, and given that I have concluded that the proposal would be acceptable, I can see no reason why it would lead to harmful developments on other sites in the area.
18. The Council in their assessment of the planning application have considered the impact of the proposal against the living conditions of the neighbouring occupiers and have raised no objections, I see no reason to disagree.

Conditions

19. I have imposed the standard time limit condition and have specified the approved plans as this provides certainty. A condition is necessary for the materials to match those that are used in the existing property to maintain the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

20. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed.

S Witherley

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

21. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal should be allowed.

Chris Preston

INSPECTOR