



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 January 2022

by T J Burnham BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 January 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/H0724/D/21/3287391

2 Chaucer Avenue, Hartlepool TS25 5PY

- 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 Phillip Batty against the decision of Hartlepool Borough Council.
 - The application Ref H/2021/0267, dated 31 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 16 September 2021.
 - The development proposed is 2 storey side extension, single storey rear extension. 2m boundary wall and fence to part of the side and rear with new opening to low existing wall and new drive pavement crossing and dropped kerb.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of the proposal has altered from the application form to the Council decision notice. The original description adequately describes the proposals and I have considered the appeal on this basis. I acknowledge that the scheme has been amended and now proposes the retention of the existing boundary wall.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The proposal relates to a modest yet well-proportioned two storey semi-detached dwelling, which along with the neighbouring property immediately to the south incorporates a hipped roof.
5. The property sits on a well sized plot and substantial space is available within the site to the north elevation of the dwelling. It sits in a prominent position, set back behind the wide grass verge of Chaucer Avenue.
6. The provision of a driveway access from Browning Avenue to the north by way of a wide driveway across the verge would result in the loss of some of the verge. However, this would not be to the significant detriment of the area given that large, grassed areas would remain both within that verge and fronting Chaucer Close, protecting the character of the area in this particular respect.
7. Given the space that is available to the northern side elevation, the significant width of the two-storey side extension, which would not be as wide as the host

dwelling, could be accommodated. The same would be the case for the single storey rear extension.

8. Both hip and gable roofs are common features on residential properties within the immediate area. However, the inclusion of both roof types on one property is not common. The proposed design, however, seeks to do so and as a result, the resultant roof would take on a rather bulky, uncomfortable, and unbalanced appearance considering that the property as existing and that adjoining incorporate hipped roofs.
9. Further, owing to the proposed inclusion of a garage within the front part of the side extension with vehicular access from Browning Avenue, only a high level, obscure glazed window is included to the front elevation of the extension at ground floor level. In contrast to the well balanced and well-proportioned openings on the existing front elevation this would leave the front elevation of the property with a rather awkward and un-resolved appearance.
10. I accept that the proposals have undergone revisions and that matching materials are proposed. However, also taking account of the somewhat awkward step-in to the frontage of the ground floor on the corner of the garage, the design of the two-storey extension is uncomfortable and unresolved.
11. The extension would therefore be unsympathetic to the host dwelling and would have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the area given its degree of visibility from Chaucer Avenue and Browning Avenue.
12. The proposal would subsequently conflict with Policies HSG11 and QP4 of the Hartlepool Local Plan (2018) which amongst other things require extensions and alterations to existing dwellings to be of a high design quality and to be sympathetic to the existing dwelling while not adversely affecting the character of the area.

Other Matters

13. I accept that there are some large extensions in the area including that at No.7 Browning Avenue. However, no extension has been brought to my attention that would have the same design and I therefore afford limited weight to their presence in terms of justification for this proposal.
14. The scheme would provide enlarged family accommodation at the site, however there is nothing to indicate that this could not also be achieved through an alternative design. I also therefore afford this matter limited weight.
15. The evidence indicates that the proposal would not harm the living conditions of nearby occupiers, but this is a pre-requisite of such development and this is therefore a neutral matter.

Conclusion

16. The proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area and would conflict with the development plan taken as a whole. There are no material considerations which indicate that the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

T J Burnham

INSPECTOR