



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 June 2022

by M J Francis BA (Hons) MA MSc MCIfA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11th July 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/W0734/D/22/3298425

5 Barnack Avenue, Middlesbrough TS7 8QB

- 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 Paul and Donna Robinson against the decision of Middlesbrough Council.
 - The application Ref 22/0095/FUL, dated 9 February 2022, was refused by notice dated 4 April 2022.
 - The development proposed is described as "single storey extension at front and new pitched roof over."
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey extension at front and new pitched roof at 5 Barnack Avenue, Middlesbrough, TS7 8QB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 22/0095/FUL, dated 9 February 2022, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:

1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.

2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

Location plan and proposed block plan; Drawing 01 'Existing and Proposed Plans, Elevations and Sections'; and Drawing 02 'Proposed plans'.

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 dwellinghouse.

Application for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Mr & Mrs Paul and Donna Robinson against Middlesbrough Council. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Procedural Matter

3. The submitted plans show some alterations that are proposed at the rear of the dwelling, but I am only dealing here with those relating to the front of the building. Although I have reproduced the description from the planning application as I am obliged to do, I have used the Council's re-wording in the decision above which makes it clearer.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the dwelling and the local area.

Reasons

5. No 5 Barnack Avenue is a detached two storey modern house on a residential estate. The character within the road is mixed but near to the appeal site is characterised by a number of medium sized detached houses. No 5 is however within a row of four houses which have been built to a similar design. Each of these houses has a stepped, single storey projection to the front which extends part way across the width of the buildings. Other houses within the road have been the subject of a variety of alterations from the original form. The proposal would extend the front projection at the appeal site across the whole width of the dwelling. This would have a lean-to pitched and hipped roof.
6. The proposal would be limited in scale, would not protrude further forward than the existing front projection and would be constructed of similar materials.
7. Although the proposed pitched roof would differ from the adjoining properties in this row, it would not in my opinion, be out of keeping, or as prominent as to have a detrimental impact on the character of the dwelling and the neighbouring properties as considered by the Council. It would follow a pattern of single storey extensions, of differing designs, including those that have hipped roofs. The appellants have drawn attention to a number of other front extensions in the area which I looked at when I visited. The Council refers to the adjacent properties having flat roofed single storey extensions but No 3, the neighbouring property also has a prominent pitched roof to the front. Despite Middlesbrough's Urban Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document, adopted January 2013 (SPD) stating that extensions to the front of houses are generally unacceptable in principle, it does allow for limited but well-designed extensions in certain circumstances, I am satisfied that this is such an instance because the proposal is well-designed and appropriate for this location.
8. An extension to the front, ref 18/0739/FUL, the same design as the current proposal, was also previously approved by the Council. It is agreed that this is no longer capable of being implemented but there appears to have been no apparent change in policies that are drawn to my attention.
9. I therefore consider that the proposal would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the dwelling or the local area. This would be well integrated with the immediate as well as the wider context and the design would be of high quality in its relationship with the surrounding area. This would therefore accord with Policies DC1 and CS5 of the Middlesbrough Local Development Framework, Core Strategy adopted February 2008 and the SPD.

Conditions

10. In imposing the conditions, I have had regard to the tests for planning conditions in paragraph 56 of the National Planning Policy Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance. In this respect there is a need for the standard implementation condition and a condition listing the plans to which the

proposal should accord. To ensure the satisfactory appearance and form of development, a condition ensuring that the materials match the existing house is necessary.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above and having considered all other matters raised including the development plan as a whole, the appeal is allowed.

M J Francis

INSPECTOR