



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 September 2021 by Ifeanyi Chukwujekwu BSc MSc MIEMA
CEnv MRTPI

Decision by Chris Preston BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 November 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/H0724/D/21/3276751 65 Spalding Road, Hartlepool TS25 2JS

- 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 Robert Raine against the decision of Hartlepool Borough Council.
 - The application Ref H/2021/0146, dated 25 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 18 May 2021.
 - The development proposed is raising of roofline with steeper pitch and roof lights to create loft room¹.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

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.

Main Issue

3. The effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding street scene.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. No. 65 is a detached two-storey dwelling located at the junction of Spalding Road where it turns off northward towards a junction with Mowbray Road. The property incorporates a two-storey extension on the western side which features a dual pitched roof, pitched front to back and gabled to the side. This addition is lower than the main building and the different roof form provides a clear distinction between the original property and the side extension. This enables the original proportions to be viewed and ensures that the extension presents a subservient appearance when viewed from the street.
5. The surrounding area is residential, and the street scene characterised by a mix of detached and semi-detached, single and two-storey dwellings of relatively similar design and size save for a number of extensions.

¹ Taken from Council decision notice as more succinct.

6. The appeal property is bounded to the east by no.65a which is a modest single-storey annex, and to the west by nos.63 and 61 which are a pair of semi-detached two storey dwellings. The property already stands out on the street by virtue of its scale in comparison with other surrounding properties and its prominent position on the street. The ridgeline is already slightly higher than the neighbouring semi-detached dwellings and substantially higher than the bungalow at No.65a.
7. The proposal would result in an increase in the overall height at the ridge, thus creating a single dual pitched roof, instead of the present staggered roofline. As a result, the extension would no longer appear subservient to the main building and the mass and volume of the roof would be significantly increased. I recognise that there is a variety of property types in the area. Nonetheless, the proposal would result in an incongruous dwelling that would be conspicuously larger and higher than its neighbours. By virtue of its scale and design, the steeper pitch would appear overly dominant and disproportionate to the host property and its surroundings.
8. I find that the development would significantly harm the character and appearance of the host property and the street scene. Accordingly, it would conflict with the objectives of policy HSG11 of Hartlepool's Local Plan (2018) and paragraphs 126 and 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021). These seek amongst other things to ensure that proposals for new development such as extensions to existing dwellings is of a size and design that is sympathetic to the existing dwelling and does not adversely affect the character of the surrounding residential area.

Conclusion and Recommendation

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

Ifeanyi Chukwujekwu

APPEALS PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

10. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report, and on that basis, I agree with the recommendation and shall dismiss the appeal.

Chris Preston

INSPECTOR.