



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: 19 April 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/V0728/D/23/3315272

2 Swallow Close, Guisborough TS14 8HL

- 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 Del against the decision of Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council.
 - The application Ref R/2022/0835/RT, dated 7 November 2022, was refused by notice dated 20 December 2022.
 - The development proposed is single storey rear extension, revision to windows and doors and render to side elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for proposed single storey rear extension, revision to windows and doors and render to side elevation at 2 Swallow Close, Guisborough TS14 8HL in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref R/2022/0835/RT, dated 7 November 2022, and the Site Location Plan; Block/Site Plan; Proposed Plans and Elevations Drawing No. 02 Rev B including in respect of the finishing materials.

Procedural Matter

2. The proposed development has largely been complete except for the lantern light. The appeal before me has therefore been assessed on a partly retrospective basis. As part of my site visit, I was able to see the works that have already taken place on site which do not fully accord with the drawings submitted as part of this appeal. I have therefore determined the appeal based on the plans the Council based its decision on.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are:
 - The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area; and
 - The effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of occupiers of 4 Swallow Close in relation to outlook and light.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal property relates to a single-storey semi-detached dwelling located within a residential setting where surrounding properties vary in size and design. Many nearby properties benefit from extensions/dormers to the rear

facing Swallow Close along with garage structures which are located between the pavement and the rear of the properties forming an enclosure to the rear garden areas.

5. The appellant has previously submitted a householder notification application for a flat roofed rear extension where the Council deemed that prior approval was not required. This application allowed for a rear extension measuring 4.5 metres in depth, 2.5 metres in height to the flat roof and 3.36 metres to the top of the lantern light.
6. Whilst the rear extension as built is slightly taller to its flat roof than the previous scheme and would have a slightly taller total height to the lantern light, it would remain single storey of a relatively low height with an overall design similar and complimentary to that of the main property even taking into account concerns raised regarding the stonework. This, together with the limited depth which has already been considered under the householder notification application where the Council deemed that prior approval was not required remains subordinate to the main property. The proposed lantern light element would be located centrally on the flat roof, and would be of a limited height, depth, and width as well as comprising a glazed form. It would therefore not appear overly prominent in this context. I acknowledge concerns that the proposed lantern light element would be less visible given the increase in height of the parapet wall. However, this would not change my findings on its overall acceptability taking into account the above.
7. Additionally, the extension is located back from the pavement and the garages serving the adjacent properties help to screen the development from views on approaching the site along Swallow Close and views of the extension are only apparent when viewed from the direct south of the site. As a result, the extension has a very limited effect upon the street scene and does not appear discordant when viewed in context of the diverse appearance of rear extensions/dormers nearby and the garages which front the footpath and main road and are more visible within the street scene.
8. I conclude that the extension does not appear as a prominent addition and does not unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area. Accordingly, I find the proposed development to accord with part j of Policy SD4 of the Redcar and Cleveland Local Plan 2018 (LP) which amongst other matters, requires development to respect or enhance the character of the site and its surroundings in terms of its proportion, form, massing, height, size, scale, materials and detailed design features.

Living conditions

9. The extension sits on the boundary with the attached property of 4 Swallow Close (No. 4) and this property has windows in its rear elevation within close proximity to the extension. However, the relatively low height of the extension and flat roof form, together with the limited overall depth, ensures that the extension is not visually overbearing for the occupiers of No.4.
10. I appreciate that due to the depth of the extension from the rear elevation, it is in breach of the guidelines set out within the Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document 2013 which states that for semi-detached houses, the maximum depth normally acceptable is 3.5 metres. However, the depth of the extension has already been considered under the

householder notification application where the Council deemed that prior approval was not required. Although the extension is slightly taller than the previous scheme and the lantern light would also be slightly taller, the minimal difference would not result in a significant adverse effect in this regard.

11. At my site visit, I was able to see that the extension caused a very small shadow over the garden area of No.4 to the western boundary. However, given the overall limited height and depth, the building did not significantly reduce the amount of sunlight reaching the rear windows and private garden of the attached property and does not result in poor living conditions for existing occupiers.
12. I conclude that the extension does not have an unacceptable impact on the living conditions of the occupiers of No. 4 Swallow Close in relation to outlook and light. The proposed development therefore complies with part b of Policy SD4 of the LP which amongst other matters, permits development where it will not have a significant adverse impact on the amenities of occupiers of existing or proposed nearby land and buildings.

Conditions

13. I have considered the conditions suggested by the Council taking into account the partly retrospective nature of the appeal. I have included the approved drawings, which detail the finishing materials, in the terms of my decision in the interests of certainty.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above and having had regard to the development plan as a whole, the appeal should be allowed.

N Teasdale

INSPECTOR