



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 June 2022

by H Jones BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20th June 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/W0734/D/22/3297040

4 Farmside Mews, Marton, Middlesbrough, TS8 9UR

- 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 Farrel against the decision of Middlesbrough Council.
 - The application Ref 22/0108/FUL, dated 9 February 2022, was refused by notice dated 4 April 2022.
 - The development proposed is described as an “orangerie”.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons

3. Farmside Mews is a residential development located within an area which is suburban in overall character. Though the area comprises of a range of residential estates, it is appreciable that the different estates and streets have their own distinguishing design features. Consistent with this, Farmside Mews has distinctive design elements which create a cohesion to the development but also sets it apart from neighbouring streets.
4. The proposal would include a flat roof that Middlesbrough’s Urban Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) advises would not normally be acceptable, although the Council indicate that they could be where incorporated into a high quality design solution. However, in this case, though the general appearance of the development can be drawn from the plans, they lack the necessary detail to demonstrate, clearly and precisely, the finished appearance of the extension. Detail on the treatments to be given to junction points of the roof lantern with the remains of the roof, the roof to the elevations including the extent of and approaches to fascia boarding, for example, are absent.
5. Unsympathetic approaches to finer detail can significantly detract from the design of a proposal. Farmside Mews, exhibits a cohesive and visually attractive character which in part stems from specific approaches to design detailing and No 4 contributes towards this. I note the suggestions that the Council may be insisting that flat roof extensions have parapet wall details. Whether or not that is the case, and irrespective of the effect that may have on views out through roof windows or the living conditions of neighbours, the proposal before me does not display detailing befitting the quality of Farmside Mews.

6. Policies CS5 and DC1 of the Middlesbrough Core Strategy 2008 (CS), require development proposals to demonstrate a high quality of design, that they would integrate well into the immediate and wider context and ensure an enhancement of the built environment. This is reflective of advice within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which, at paragraph 130, states that planning decisions should ensure that development adds to the overall quality of the area, developments are visually attractive as a result of good architecture and are sympathetic to local character. I cannot conclude that the proposal would deliver the high standard of design necessary to be sympathetic to the host property or successfully assimilate into the area and in turn I find the proposal contrary to these policies and content within the NPPF.

Other Matters

7. It may be that some extensions of this nature and scale may not require planning permission. This could lead to inconsistency whereby those extensions for which planning permission is sought are required to accord with the Council's design requirements with no such requirement for those which do not. However, in this instance an application was submitted and the appeal must be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given, the proposal would conflict with the development plan taken as a whole. There have been no material considerations put to me that would be worthy of sufficient weight to indicate a decision otherwise than in accordance with it. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

H Jones

INSPECTOR