



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 April 2024

by H Jones BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14th May 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/V0728/D/24/3338322

15 Mossdale Grove, Guisborough, Redcar and Cleveland TS14 8JB

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Mrs E McClure against the decision of Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council.
- The application Ref is R/2023/0622/FF.
- The development proposed is for alterations and extensions to garage including pitched roof and dormer extensions to form first floor office space/games room.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for alterations and extensions to garage including pitched roof and dormer extensions to form first floor office space/games room at 15 Mossdale Grove, Guisborough, Redcar and Cleveland TS14 8JB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref R/2023/0622/FF, 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:

Site Location Plan
Block/Site Plan
Proposed Plans – Page 04 Rev 2
Proposed Roof Plan – Page 05 Rev 2
Proposed Elevations – Page 06 Rev 2
 - 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.

Preliminary Matters

2. In Part E of the appeal form it is stated that the description of development has not changed from that provided on the application form. However, a different wording has been entered which matches that on the Council's decision notice. The description on the appeal form more accurately describes the development shown on the submitted plans and, therefore, I have included it in my decision and banner heading above.
3. On 19 December 2023, a revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published. I have had regard to the revised Framework in so far as it is relevant to this appeal.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

5. Mossdale Grove is a residential cul-de-sac. The appeal site, 15 Mossdale Grove (No 15), is a semi-detached dormer bungalow located at the head of the cul-de-sac. The closest neighbouring properties are quite similarly designed dormer bungalows. However, elsewhere on Mossdale Grove there is a range of house types including 2 storey detached houses and detached bungalows. Consequently, the street scene is varied in appearance, and it is not characterised by uniformity.
6. Many of the properties on Mossdale Grove are served by modest single garages, and positioned at the back of long driveways, they are inconspicuous in the street scene. In contrast, No 15's garage and the garage beside it are both large double space garages with ancillary accommodation. For this reason, together with their position at the head of the cul-de-sac, they are more prominent than the other garages. This results in these 2 garages already appearing anomalous.
7. Although the garage would increase in size, including markedly in height, it has been designed to a high standard. The ridge of the pitched roof would, appropriately, be set below that of the bungalow. This would ensure that the garage would remain subservient. The 3 dormer windows proposed are each modestly proportioned and would be well positioned on the roof slope – set in from the edge of the roof, set above the eaves and below the ridge. The dormers would also add variation to the front roof slope and serve to break down the mass of the heightened garage when viewed from the street.
8. Therefore, given the variety of properties on Mossdale Grove, the host garage's position within the street and the extension's design, the proposal would be a sympathetic addition to the street scene and it would not be harmfully dominant or overbearing. Consequently, the effect of the development upon the character and appearance of the area would be acceptable.
9. The proposal would comply with policy SD4 of the Redcar and Cleveland Local Plan which, amongst other matters, requires all development to be designed to a high standard and remain respectful to the character of the site and its surroundings. I also find that the proposal would be compliant with guidance within the Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document. The guiding principles of this document include that residential extensions and alterations should respect or enhance the existing dwelling, contribute positively to the street scene and contribute to a sense of place and quality.

Conditions

10. I have imposed the standard time limit condition. A condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans is necessary in the interests of certainty. To protect the character and appearance of the area, a condition is also needed to secure the appropriate use of materials.

Conclusion

11. The proposed development accords with the development plan, and there are no material considerations which indicate a decision should be made other than in accordance with it. Therefore, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed subject to the conditions above.

H Jones

INSPECTOR