



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 March 2023

by N Teasdale BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17th April 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/V0728/D/23/3314165

12 Coach Road, Brotton TS12 2RW

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant full planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Colin Peters against the decision of Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council.
 - The application Ref R/2022/0744/FF, dated 7 September 2022, was refused by notice dated 30 November 2022.
 - The development proposed is single storey extension to side and rear of existing semi-detached dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed forward projecting canopy element of the extension on the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site accommodates a semi-detached dwelling located within a row of other similar residential properties that are set back from the street with large garden areas and parking to the front. The properties along this side of Coach Road particularly from No. 2 to No. 36 have a very consistent frontage with an arched recessed porch which forms a key feature of the dwellings. Along with their elevated position above street level, this cohesive form and appearance combined with their prominence contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area. There are very limited structures forward of the building line of the dwellings along this side of the road which creates a sense of openness within the street scene.
4. Due to the site's location adjacent the road and the prominence of the frontage of the dwellings, the proposed canopy would be highly visible when viewed from the pavement and Coach Road including views on approaching the site along that road.
5. Although the proposed garage element of the extension would sit flush with the front elevation, the proposed canopy would project forward from the front elevation and would extend over both the proposed garage element and the existing arched recessed porch. As a result, the proposed canopy would interrupt the form and appearance of the building and this, together with the significant width and positioning above the arched porch would compromise the

cohesive appearance of the host property and the wider street scene appearing as a contrived and obvious addition at odds with other properties.

6. My attention has been drawn to a number of previous planning permissions for other front canopies along Coach Road and within the wider vicinity. Whilst I accept that there are other canopies projecting forward of the building line elsewhere along Coach Road, such properties are located further along the road beyond No. 36 where the design of the frontage changes particularly in relation to the arched recessed porch feature; or are on the other side of the road or along other streets. They are therefore read differently when viewed as part of the immediate street scene. As a result, they are not directly comparable.
7. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area. As such, it would be contrary to the guidance within the Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document 2013 and to Policy SD4 (J and K) of the Redcar and Cleveland Local Plan 2018 which together, amongst other matters, requires proposals to respect or enhance the character of the site and its surroundings in terms of its detailed design features.

Conclusion

8. The proposed development would conflict with the development plan when considered as a whole. There are no material considerations, either individually or in combination, that outweighs the identified harm and associated plan conflict. I conclude that the appeal should therefore be dismissed.

N Teasdale

INSPECTOR