



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 16 November 2021

by Katherine Robbie BA(Hons) DipTP MTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 November 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/H0724/D/21/3282089
28 Chichester Close, Hartlepool TS25 2QT

- 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 D Hayes against the decision of Hartlepool Borough Council.
 - The application Ref H/2021/0247, dated 22 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 29 July 2021.
 - The development proposed is a single storey side extension as garage with store, new driveway and a new fence to enclose rear garden on highway side.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for a single storey side extension as garage with store, new driveway and a new fence to enclose rear garden on the highway side at 28 Chichester Close, Hartlepool in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref H/2021/0247, dated 22 May 2021, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following 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 the following approved plans: Location Plan 1:1250; Proposed Site Plan 1:500; Existing scale 1:100 July 9th 2021; Proposed scale 1:100 July 9th 2021.
 - 3) The external materials to be used in the construction of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a two-storey detached house on a corner plot at the head of Chichester Close. The front of the property faces into the turning head of the cul-de-sac. The Close consists of a mixture of two storey detached houses and bungalows with open frontages, set back from the carriageway with relatively generous spacing around them creating a feeling of openness within the street scene.
4. The extension would extend approximately 3.5 metres from the side of the house towards the highway. Whilst it would be visible from within the Close, it

would appear subservient to the host property. It would not appear as an incongruous feature or out of character with the residential nature of the surrounding area.

5. The proposed development is well-designed with a hipped roof similar in style to other extensions and attached garages on the estate. The proposal would therefore not be out of keeping with its surroundings in this respect.
6. The proposal involves extending the enclosed area of garden by just over a metre with a close boarded fence which would tie into the side elevation of the garage. Whilst this would reduce the open space at the side of the house, there would be sufficient space retained to ensure that the openness of the area is not unacceptably diminished. On my site visit I observed a variety of boundary types on the estate and its sinuous layout means there is no strong building line to follow. The proposal would therefore not look incongruous or have any adverse impact on the sense of openness within the estate or affect the way it functions.
7. I conclude that the proposed development would not be unsympathetic with respect to its design, scale or siting and would therefore not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling or the surrounding area. Accordingly, I find no conflict with Policies HSG11 and QP4 of the Hartlepool Local Plan which seek to resist poorly designed development or Paragraph 134 of the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks to achieve good design sympathetic to the local area.

Conditions

8. I have considered the Council's suggested conditions in light of the Framework and Planning Practice Guidance. I agree that time limit and plans conditions are necessary and reasonable in the interests of good planning and to provide certainty. I have also attached a matching materials condition which is necessary and reasonable in the interests of character and appearance.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above, and having considered the development plan as a whole and all relevant material considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Katherine Robbie

INSPECTOR