



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: 28th June 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/W0734/D/22/3297415

17 Bonny Grove, Middlesbrough, TS8 9QZ

- 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 & Mrs David Bisp against the decision of Middlesbrough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/1098/FUL, dated 24 November 2021, was refused by notice dated 28 January 2022.
 - The development proposed is described as a two storey side extension.
-

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 17 Bonny Grove and the area.

Reasons

3. No 17 is a detached house located within a residential area. Properties on Bonny Grove are served by a main highway and a secondary spur. No 17 is situated on a corner where this spur commences. The land is undulating, neighbouring properties 16 and 15 Bonny Grove are set on higher land than the host property whilst 28 Bonny Grove, separated from these properties via the highway, is set on land lower than No 17. It is part of the character of the area that properties cascade with the topography.
4. Middlesbrough's Urban Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) provides advice in respect to two storey side extensions. The SPD highlights that such extensions can cause overbearing impacts on the street scene and a terracing impact upon pairs of semi-detached houses. To prevent such harm, the SPD, amongst other advice, states that the first floor section of the extension should be set back by 1m with an associated reduction in the height of the extension. The SPD also states that such forms of extension should be no more than half the width of the original dwelling so as to remain in proportion.
5. Whilst the proposed side extension would incorporate a hipped roof profile, the height would match that of the existing dwelling. The width of the extension would not, alone, be disproportionate but the front elevation would have only a marginal recess behind the building line of the existing two storey element of the property. Consequently, the front elevation of the property and roofscape would be widened without design interventions which would adequately serve

to break this mass down. This would appear particularly dominating in this location given the way that the dwellings cascade down the hill and that the road beside is lower still. Discussions may have been held between the main parties in regard to further recessing the first floor of the proposal, but I do not know the full detail of these discussions, a further recess is not shown on the plans and I must determine the appeal on the basis of the information before me.

6. I viewed the extension work at No 19 Bonny Grove on my site visit. That extension includes amendments to the roof and the incorporation of dormer windows. It is not comparable to the side extension proposed and I find nothing in that development which lends support to this proposal. More generally, though the different housetypes on the estate provides some variety to the character of the area, this in itself does not justify the specific design of the side extension.
7. As a result, I consider that the proposal would be harmful and the development would be contrary to Policies CS5 and DC1 of the Middlesbrough Core Strategy 2008 which state, amongst other matters, that all development proposals are required to demonstrate a high standard of design, take account of their relationship with the surrounding area and ensure a quality of new development that enhances the built environment. The harm I have identified is contrary to advice within the National Planning Policy Framework, which, at paragraph 130, requires that development is visually attractive, sympathetic to local character and adds to the overall quality of an area.

Other Matters

8. The appellant explains that the nature of the site is such that the host property is not conducive to other forms of extension. There may well be constraints but the proposal before me has not been shown to be the only option to extend the property so I give this matter limited weight.
9. The appellant highlights that neighbouring property occupiers have not objected to the proposals. Whilst this may be the case and living conditions of nearby residents may not be unacceptably affected, the absence of objection does not in itself render the scheme appropriate nor overcome my concerns.
10. Finally, the appellant raises concerns with the manner and timeliness in which the Council determined the application but this has little to do with the planning merits of the case.

Conclusion

11. 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