



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 February 2022

**by C Megginson**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 1<sup>st</sup> March 2022**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/V0728/D/21/3288522**

**2 Cotswold Drive, Redcar, TS10 4AG**

- 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 B McBride against the decision of Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council.
  - The application Ref R/2021/0670/FF, dated 2 August 2021, was refused by notice dated 26 October 2021.
  - The development proposed is a single storey side extension.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for a single storey side extension at 2 Cotswold Drive, Redcar, TS10 4AG in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref R/2021/0670/FF, dated 2 August 2021, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
  - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Location Plan dated 13/11/20; Block/Site Plan stated to have been received 5/08/21, in relation to the proposed side extension only; Existing Plans and Elevations Drawing No 01 0, dated 16/01/20 and Proposed Plans and Elevations Drawing No 02B, revised 18/06/21.
  - 2) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
  - 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.

### Main Issue

2. The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

### Reasons

3. The appeal site is a two-storey semi-detached house set on a corner plot of Cotswold Drive and Chiltern Avenue. The surrounding area along Cotswold Drive and to the south of Chiltern Avenue contains similar semi-detached properties, many of which have been extended in different ways, including single storey extensions on corner plots. North of Chiltern Avenue is a large

school site with expansive playing fields facing onto the side of the appeal property.

4. There is a garage with a driveway onto Chiltern Avenue at the rear of the appeal property, adjacent to No 1 Chiltern Avenue. This property, and the building line of Chiltern Avenue as a whole, sits forward of the existing side elevation of the appeal property, when viewed from Cotswold Drive.
5. The proposed single storey side extension would extend 5 metres towards the site boundary. However, due to the size of the corner plot, around 7.2 metres would remain between the side wall of the proposed extension and the side boundary of the property. This side boundary facing Chiltern Avenue is enclosed by a high fence along its length. Mature dense planting sits inside the fence, and in turn forms the boundary behind a low wall.
6. Due to its position on the corner, the appeal proposal would be visible from various directions above the fence and hedge. However, the design of the proposal would be fully subordinate to the host dwelling, being set back off the main elevation and featuring similar fenestration to the existing dwelling. Furthermore, the extension would not be prominent within the street scene due to its scale; in many views it would be seen against the backdrop of the main house, the large corner plot and surrounding streets.
7. The Redcar and Cleveland Local Development Framework Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (2013) (SPD), advises that generally side extensions should have a width no greater than half the width of the original dwelling. The existing dwelling is around 6 metres wide, with the proposal being some 5 metres wide. However, while this would be contrary to the SPD, I note that a two-storey side extension to the appeal property with the same width as the proposal before me was approved in January 2021. While the proposal would not create a terraced effect such as the approved scheme may well do, for the reasons given above, I am satisfied that the appeal proposal would not appear unbalanced or overbearing.
8. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. Accordingly, I find no conflict with Policy SD4 of the Redcar and Cleveland Local Plan (2018) or with the principles of the SPD which seek to ensure satisfactory design that respects or enhances the character of the site and its surroundings, or those principles of the National Planning Policy Framework that seek good design sympathetic to the local area.

## Conditions

9. I have considered the Council's suggested conditions in light of the Framework and Planning Practice Guidance. I agree that a plans condition is necessary and reasonable in the interests of certainty. In this respect I note that on the 'Block/Site Plan' two additional structures appear to be shown marked in red, one of which may be the existing garage. The condition has been clarified to note that the consent only relates to the proposed side extension. I have also attached a matching materials condition in the interests of the character and appearance of the area.

## **Conclusion**

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

*C. Megginson*

INSPECTOR