



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 January 2022

by Richard Newsome BA (Hons) MTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 February 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/W0734/D/21/3285002

180 Acklam Road, Middlesbrough TS5 4HA

- 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 Matthew Blanks against the decision of Middlesbrough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/0137/FUL, dated 3 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 29 July 2021.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side extension and part single, part two storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a 2-storey semi-detached dwelling located on a main road in a predominantly residential area. It is one of a number of consecutive pairs of similar semi-detached dwellings on Acklam Road. The surrounding area is generally comprised of 2-storey semi-detached and terraced dwellings with some bungalows.
4. The appeal property is brick faced and has a prominent front gable projection with a ground floor bay window. It also has a 2-storey set back which is subservient to the gable projection with a door to the side of the dwelling. The dwelling has a Dutch style roof design which is tiled. The dwelling is set back from the highway behind a low hedge and front garden with a private driveway adjacent to the front garden. There is a long garden to the rear of the dwelling.
5. The 2-storey side extension element of the proposal would project from the side of the dwelling to the boundary with 178 Acklam Road, and project from the building line of the front set back to match the depth of the proposed rear extension. The extension to the rear of the dwelling would be single storey in part close to the boundary with the rear garden of 182 Acklam Road with the remaining majority being 2-storey in height. The proposal would also involve the relocation of the main door of the property to the front elevation.
6. The appellant has advised that the proposed roof to the 2-storey element of the proposal would be hipped to match the existing roof and would retain the prominent Dutch roof style found within the surrounding area. However, I note

that neither the existing nor the proposed drawings before me include details of a Dutch roof style. Both indicate only a standard hipped roof style. Therefore, I have proceeded with determining the appeal on the basis that the proposal would include a standard hipped roof style as per the submitted drawings before me.

7. I consider that the Dutch roof style is a key characteristic of the local area, particularly within the group of semi-detached dwellings containing the appeal property. The introduction of a standard hipped roof on the extension would be incongruous to the character and appearance of the attached semi-detached dwelling at No 182 which has a Dutch roof style, and also the wider area. The proposed roof would also unacceptably add to the scale and mass of the property and not be subservient to the original host dwelling.
8. I appreciate that the proposed side extension would not be more than half the width of the original dwelling in accordance with the guidance in the Council's Urban Design Supplementary Planning Document (2013) (the SPD). However, whilst the side extension would be to the elevation set back from the gable projection, it would result in the set back elevation being more than double its current width. This would not be subordinate to the existing set back elevation or the host dwelling. It would also diminish the dominance of the gable projection on the existing property frontage. The width of the side extension would also unduly unbalance the symmetry of the pair of semi-detached properties which also have value as part of the wider group of similar pairs in the street scene.
9. Therefore, by virtue of their scale, design, and mass the 2-storey side extension and revisions to the roof would result in unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling, the pair of semi-detached dwellings, and the surrounding area.
10. The depth of the rear extension would be consistent with the maximum depth set out for such extensions in the SPD. The width of the 2-storey element of the rear extension would be similar to the width of the existing rear elevation of the host dwelling. Therefore, it would not be subservient to the host dwelling in terms of scale and massing. However, there would be limited views of the rear extension from public locations, and it would be set in a generous garden. Therefore, I consider that the rear extension would not unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling or the area.
11. I have been made aware that 190 Acklam Road, a nearby semi-detached property, has been extended to include a 2-storey side extension following the grant of planning permission. I acknowledge that the appellant considers some of the Council's views about the unacceptability of the extension at No 190 following its construction to be valid to an extent. However, I note that the appellant considers that it is not completely relatable to the proposal due to distinct differences between them and does not cause harm to the street scape. However, I do not have full details that led to the proposal at No 190 being accepted, and in any event, I have considered this appeal proposal on its own merits and concluded that it would cause harm for the reasons set out above.
12. Overall, I conclude that the proposal would result in unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling, the pair of semi-detached dwellings, and the surrounding area. As such, the proposal would be contrary to Policies DC1(b) and CS5(c) of the Council's Core Strategy (2008) and the

principles of the SPD. Taken together they require that development should be of a high quality in respect of visual appearance, layout, and relationship with the immediate and wider surrounding area in terms of scale, design, and materials. The proposal would also be contrary to Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which amongst other things, requires that development is of a high quality design and sympathetic to local character.

Other Matters

13. I acknowledge that the appellant has expressed disappointment about the way the planning application was determined by the Council. I also note that the appellant has sought to try and work with the Council to arrive at a mutually agreeable solution. Whilst I appreciate the Council's decision must have caused them concern, I have assessed the proposal on its merits in light of up-to-date planning policies.
14. I accept that the proposal would improve the dwelling for the occupants and provide them with the additional space that they require. However, these matters do not outweigh or alter my conclusion on the main issue.

Conclusion

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

Richard Newsome

INSPECTOR