



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 November 2023

by H Jones BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 January 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/W0734/D/23/3328303

74 Heythrop Drive, Acklam TS5 8QN

- 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 Rashid Mahmood against the decision of Middlesbrough Council.
 - The application Ref 23/0298/FUL, dated 23 May 2023, was refused by notice dated 19 July 2023.
 - The development proposed was originally described as "First floor rear extension. Loft conversion with dormer."
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of the development in the banner heading above is taken from the application form. However, the submitted plans do not show a loft conversion with dormer. The Council dealt with the proposal on the basis that planning permission was sought for a first floor rear extension and so shall I.
3. In December 2023 a revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published. In reaching my decision, I have had regard to the content of the revised Framework.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the host property and of the area.

Reasons

5. 74 Heythrop Drive is a semi-detached house located within a residential area. No 74 has been extended previously to its side and rear. Other properties in the area have also been extended.
6. Given the various extensions which have been undertaken at the host property, it has a varied roofscape. As existing and above the first floor accommodation, the roofscape exhibits both dual pitched elements and a hipped roof with 3 roof slopes. In the proposal, above the additional first floor accommodation proposed, a catslide type roof would be incorporated. In so doing, a further different form of roof would be introduced to the property at this level. Its pitch would also be shallow and would differ from the pitch angles that exist beside it. Consequently, the proposed extension would appear at odds with the first floor roof pitches of the existing property and result in a roofscape that would

appear discordant and unduly complex. This would be harmful to the property and the area.

7. In coming to this view, I acknowledge that the proposed extension would add only a quite limited amount of floorspace to the property. The proposed extension would also not protrude further than the existing first floor addition to the property or alter its ground floor. Despite this and because of its effects upon the roofscape, the proposed extension would nevertheless be harmful.
8. The appellant has drawn my attention to a number of approved applications for extensions to properties in the area. However, the full details of each of these, together with the circumstances which led to them being accepted, are not before me. This limits my ability to draw any accurate comparisons between them and the appeal proposal. Nevertheless, in reaching my decision, I acknowledge that the host property is located within an area where extensions and alterations to properties are commonplace. Even so and for the reasons given above, I have found that the particular design of the extension proposed in this case would be harmful. Therefore, the presence of various extensions in the area does not justify the proposed development.
9. As the proposed development would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the host property and of the area, it would be in conflict with Policies DC1 and CS5 of the Middlesbrough Core Strategy 2008. The proposed development would also conflict with Middlesbrough's Urban Design Supplementary Planning Document 2013. Together, these policies and provisions require that development proposals exhibit a high quality of design which would integrate well into its context, including through the incorporation of roof designs and pitches which match existing.

Conclusion

10. For the above reasons, having taken account of the development plan as a whole and all other relevant material considerations, the appeal is dismissed.

H Jones

INSPECTOR