



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 January 2023

by F Harrison BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3 February 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/V0728/D/22/3309808

46 Berkley Drive, Guisborough TS14 7LU

- 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 Chris Duley against the decision of Redcar & Cleveland Borough Council.
 - The application Ref R/2022/0379/FF, dated 20 April 2022, was refused by notice dated 5 August 2022.
 - The development proposed is two storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The appellant's name provided on the appeal form is spelt differently from that on the planning application form. For consistency, the spelling in the banner heading above is taken from the application form.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling on a corner plot, at the junction of Berkley Drive and Blackmore Close. The area is characterised by semi-detached properties, which are of varying sizes and appearance. The appeal site forms a row of semi-detached dwellings within narrow plots. While the existing side elevation does not align with the front elevations of those dwellings on Blackmore Close, there are generally strong building lines in this section of both Berkley Drive and Blackmore Close, with regular set back from the highway. This creates a harmonious character and appearance, with a clear sense of balance.
5. The proposal would introduce a two-storey side extension with materials to match existing. It would be set back from the original property with a lower ridge height. Nevertheless, the extension would not appear subservient owing to the width of the proposal which would be almost as wide as the original property. The proposal exceeds the guidance in The Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD (2013) which advises that side extensions should have a width no greater than half the width of the original dwelling. While the SPD may produce a guide, rather than absolute requirement, the width of the proposed

extension would be a bulky addition, unbalancing the pair of semi-detached dwellings and the otherwise harmonious character and appearance of the area, and would thereby appear incongruous.

6. There would be a degree of separation between the proposed extension and the footpath, nevertheless, the proposal would bring development closer to the footpath and in doing so, would extend beyond the building line observed along Blackmore Close, drawing the eye in this prominent corner plot location. The existing hedge is to be retained, nevertheless, the proposal would be clearly visible above this at first floor level, disrupting the generally consistent building line.
7. I observed a number of two storey side extensions in the wider area and have considered the example opposite the appeal site. However, the context of the example provided differs in overall appearance and relationship with the street scene. It is not on a corner plot, and the extension is subservient to the original dwelling, which is noticeably wider than the appeal property. As such it is not directly comparable to the scheme before me.
8. While it may be that the existing narrow dwelling would not be suitable for many households, and in financing an extension, the appellant would wish to maximise internal space, it has not been shown that the proposal is the only way in which to extend the property and provide additional space.
9. For the reasons given above, the proposal is harmful to the character and appearance of the area, in conflict with Policy SD4 of the Redcar & Cleveland Local Plan (2018). This policy, amongst other things, requires development to be designed to a high standard, respecting or enhancing the character of the site and its surroundings by responding to local character.
10. The proposal is also contrary to guidance set out in The Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD (2013) which advises that particular care is required in the design of extensions on a corner site, which are more prominent and visible from more than one road frontage.

Other Matters

11. The Council have not found the proposal to be harmful to the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers and I have no reason to disagree. However, policy compliance on this matter is a neutral factor.

Conclusion

12. My above findings bring the proposal into conflict with the development plan, read as a whole. There are no material considerations that have been shown to have sufficient weight to warrant a decision otherwise than in accordance with it. Therefore, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

F Harrison

INSPECTOR