



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 12 July 2021

by Paul Martinson BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 September 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/H0738/D/21/3273528
90 Greenfield Drive, Eaglescliffe TS16 0HN

- 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 Christina Basford against the decision of Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 20/2261/FUL, dated 12 October 2020, was refused by notice dated 2 February 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as 'single storey extension to side of dwelling to provide "granny flat" ground floor living accommodation consisting of lounge, kitchen, bathroom and bedroom'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey extension to side of dwelling to provide "granny flat" ground floor living accommodation consisting of lounge, kitchen, bathroom and bedroom at 90 Greenfield Drive, Eaglescliffe TS16 0HN in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 20/2261/FUL, dated 12 October 2020, subject to the conditions set out in the attached schedule.

Preliminary Matters

2. I have taken into account the revised National Planning Policy Framework ('the Framework'), as published on 20 July 2021. Any reference to the Framework below is consequently a reference to this latest revised version.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. Greenfield Drive is a suburban street comprising of a mix of detached and semi-detached dwellings of varying designs. On my site visit I saw that side extensions are a characteristic feature of the area with large numbers of properties having been extended in this way. Dwellings on Greenfield Drive tend to be sited reasonably close together and as such extensions frequently extend close to the boundaries. Single storey side extensions are prevalent and tend to consist of either attached garages (such as at 55 and 92) or living accommodation (such as at 37 and 86). I saw that large single storey extensions on corner plots were common (such as at 55, 70, 89 and 98). Roof forms of single storey side extensions are varied with a mixture of hipped, dual pitched and flat roofed extensions nearby.

5. 90 Greenfield Drive is a detached dwelling located on a corner at the junction with Oakfield Avenue. Unlike some of the neighbouring dwellings, the dwelling is angled slightly towards Oakfield Avenue rather than being aligned with the curvature of the road at this point. The dwelling has a gabled frontage and is set back from the road behind an open front garden and driveway. The garden to the rear and sides is sizeable and is enclosed by a high close boarded fence extending to the pavement edge along the boundary with Oakfield Avenue.
6. The proposal would comprise of a single storey extension to the side of the dwelling with a lean-to roof reflecting the direction of roof slope of the part of the dwelling to which it would attach. A central window to the front would be provided. The front elevation of the extension would extend to a point close to the existing fenced boundary with Oakfield Avenue. However, due to the angle of the dwelling, the side elevation of the extension would get progressively further away from the boundary as it continues towards the rear.
7. Policy SD3 of the Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council Local Plan (2019) ('the Local Plan') supports domestic extensions that are in keeping with the property and streetscene in terms of style, proportion and materials. Policy SD8 of the Local Plan requires high standards of design taking into consideration the context of the surrounding area and responding positively to, amongst other things, the quality and character of nearby buildings and the need to reinforce local distinctiveness.
8. The Council argues that due to the scale and design of the extension it would appear out of proportion and an incongruous feature at a prominent location that would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. However, having regard to the specific circumstances of this case, as I have reasoned above, the area is characterised by large side extensions, particularly at corner plots, that are comparable in scale to that of the appeal proposal. The proposal would therefore, in my view, sit harmoniously with its surrounding context and would be reflective of the character and appearance of the area rather than leading to unacceptable effects.
9. Moreover, taking into account the single storey nature of the extension, its comparatively narrower width to the front and its slight setback, as well as it being angled slightly away from the line of the road, the development would not appear out of proportion with the dwelling nor would it dominate views from Greenfield Drive or Oakfield Avenue. Whilst the roof would appear reasonably high at the point it adjoins the existing building, this is mitigated by its sloping nature. Furthermore, the roof of the extension would be well related to the host dwelling and reflective of the adjacent roofslope, albeit at a lower pitch. I also note that matching materials are proposed. For the above reasons, the proposal would not appear incongruous with reference to the host dwelling. There would therefore be no conflict with the aforementioned policies which seek to preserve character and appearance, and which on this basis, I have found would be preserved.
10. The Council has also referred to Supplementary Guidance Note 2 Householder Extension Guide (the 'SPG') which advises that extensions must be designed so that they complement the main house for example through being smaller or set back. In this regard, I note that the extension would generally be smaller than the dwelling and the comparatively narrower width of its front elevation referred to above. I also note that a sufficient portion of useable garden space

would remain which is also a requirement of the SPG. The proposal would therefore meet the requirements of the SPG.

11. For the above reasons I conclude that the proposed extension would integrate appropriately with its surroundings. The proposal would therefore comply with Policies SD3 and SD8 of the Local Plan and the guidance contained within the SPG. The proposal would also comply with paragraph 130 of the Framework which, amongst other things, seeks to ensure developments are visually attractive and sympathetic to local character. Furthermore, the proposal would not conflict with paragraph 133 of the Framework which states that permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions, taking into account any local design standards or supplementary planning documents.

Conditions

12. In addition to requiring commencement with the standard statutory period I have imposed conditions requiring compliance with the approved plans and the use of matching external materials for clarity and so as to ensure that the proposal integrates acceptably with its surroundings in line with Policies SD3 and SD8 of the Local Plan. I have also imposed a condition in relation to restricting the use to purposes ancillary to the dwelling in order to secure the use proposed and prevent other occupation.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, having considered the development plan as a whole, the approach in the Framework and all other relevant material considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed subject to the conditions below.

Paul Martinson

INSPECTOR

SCHEDULE OF 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 approved plans: Location Plan, GD:20:10:04, GD:20:10:05, GD:20:10:06.
- 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.
- 4) The extension hereby permitted shall not be occupied at any time other than for purposes ancillary to the residential use of the dwelling known as 90 Greenfield Drive.