



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 November 2023

by A Caines BSc (Hons) MSc TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23rd November 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/W0734/D/23/3330268

15 Sandling Court, Marton-In-Cleveland, Middlesbrough TS7 8QP

- 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 Christine Kearney against the decision of Middlesbrough Council.
 - The application Ref 23/0430/FUL, dated 30 July 2023, was refused by notice dated 5 September 2023.
 - The development proposed is a single-storey front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single-storey front extension at 15 Sandling Court, Marton-In-Cleveland, Middlesbrough TS7 8QP in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 23/0430/FUL, dated 30 July 2023, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 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; Proposed Site Layout; 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 building.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the development on i) the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area; and ii) the living conditions of the occupiers of 17 Sandling Court with particular regard to outlook and light.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal property is one half of a two-storey, semi-detached house located within a planned housing estate. A common feature of this particular house type is a flat roof garage/porch projection on the front elevation, although some have been extended and modernised over time. The proposal seeks to increase the width of this projection across the front elevation and add a sloping roof above it.
4. The Council's officer report states that the proposal would result in a poor overall appearance to the semi-detached pair. However, it is significant that a similar extension has already been approved and constructed on the other half

of this semi-detached pair (No 11). Currently, the difference in the front elevations gives the properties a disjointed appearance. The proposal would suitably address this, while remaining subservient in scale and respectful to the character of the property. Further, as it would not project beyond the existing garage and extension at No 11, it would not interrupt any important building line considerations or appear unduly prominent in the street.

5. In conclusion, the proposal would be a modest and sympathetically designed addition to the property, and so, would not harm the character and appearance of the host building or street scene. The existence of other similar examples in the area, as evidenced by the appellant, further reinforces my view that the proposal would not be harmful.
6. The development therefore complies with Policies DC1 and CS5 of the Middlesbrough Core Strategy 2008 (the CS). Amongst other things, these require that all new development delivers high quality design in terms of layout, form, and contribution to the character and appearance of the area.
7. In addition, the Council's Urban Design Supplementary Planning Document 2013 (SPD) states that a limited form of well-designed extension may be acceptable at the front of a house in certain circumstances. For the reasons above, the proposal can be treated as such.

Living conditions

8. The focus of the Council's concern is the effect on the front living room window of No 17. However, the proposal is single storey in height with a roof that slopes down to the front and a modest projection of approximately 3.6m from the front wall. There is also a notable gap between the properties which would provide sufficient separation between the flank wall of the extension and the window in question. Thus, even if part of the extension is visible from the living room window, this would not be to such an extent that it would appear overbearing or cause any tunnel effect.
9. Furthermore, the window faces north-east, which in combination with the modest size of the proposal and its distance from the window, would ensure that there is no significant loss of daylight or overshadowing of this window.
10. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would not harm the living conditions of the occupiers of 17 Sandling Court with regard to outlook and light, and so, complies with CS Policy DC1, and the SPD, where they seek to minimise the effect on the amenities of neighbouring occupiers.

Conditions and Conclusion

11. As suggested in the Council's questionnaire, I have imposed the standard commencement and approved plans conditions for certainty. A condition requiring the external materials to match the existing building would ensure a satisfactory appearance of the development. Subject to these conditions, and for the reasons given, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

A Caines

INSPECTOR