



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 December 2024

by K Williams MTCP (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4th February 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W0734/D/24/3350837

25 Grange Crescent, Marton TS7 8EA

- 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 Edward Taylor against the decision of Middlesbrough Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/0046/FUL.
 - The development proposed is for a single storey extension to rear including (Demolition of existing conservatory)
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey extension to rear including (Demolition of existing conservatory) at 25 Grange Crescent, Marton TS7 8EA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24/0046/FUL, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three 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; Existing Floorplans – Drawing no. GCM 01; Existing Elevations – Drawing no. GCM 02; Proposed Plans – Drawing no. GCM 03; Proposed Block Plan – Drawing no. GCM 04 Rev A; and Proposed Elevations – Drawing no. GCM 05 Rev A.
 - 3) Other than the flat roof membrane, the external materials of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Preliminary Matters

2. I have used the description of development from the Council's decision notice. The original proposal included other development which was removed from the scheme.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site comprises a substantial semi-detached red brick dwelling. It is located in a residential area with a varied arrangement of house types and age of dwellings. Many of these included large outbuildings or extension of varying forms

at the rear of the properties. Whilst some of these are visible, residential boundaries prevent extensive views in the public domain.

5. The proposal seeks to extend the property at the rear removing an existing pitched roof conservatory and rear extension. The Council has not raised any concerns regarding the height, materials, or footprint of the proposed development. It also states the development would not appear cramped and that the rear of the property is not visible from the public realm.
6. The proposal would result in the creation of a predominantly flat roof extension with a roof lantern. Whilst this does not reflect the host dwelling, the side roof planes are pitched. This would break up the overall massing of the proposal. In my view this would have the effect, particularly from views to the side, of appearing like a pitched roof, thus adequately reflecting the host dwelling. The roof lantern would also provide interest and in combination with the pitches to the side would satisfactorily lessen the impact of the flat roof against the host building.
7. Whilst the Middlesbrough Urban Design Supplementary Planning Document adopted January 2013 seeks to avoid flat roofs, the proposal is not more than one storey and its roof is articulated to avoid being entirely flat. Furthermore, the proposal would re-order the appearance of the rear elevation successfully replacing two competing rear extensions. The proposal would also integrate well using matching materials so that the overall design is enhance and cohesive.
8. Good design is not limited to that which is only visible within the public realm. However, views from neighbouring properties and gardens would be offset by existing extensions, outbuildings and landscape features. For the reasons above and as the host building is a well-established property in sizeable grounds, the limited plot coverage and scale of the extension would prevent a dominant or incongruous appearance.
9. I conclude that the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the host building or area. The proposal would be in accordance with Policies DC1 and CS5 of the Middlesbrough Local Development Framework Core Strategy, adopted February 2008. Together these policies require high quality design, which is well integrated, enhances and takes account of the visual appearance of the area.

Conditions

10. The Council has suggested that the standard conditions are imposed. In addition to the time limit, I have imposed a condition to specify the approved plans as this provides certainty. A condition is imposed which will secure matching materials to ensure the proposal is further integrated with the host property.

Conclusion

11. For the above reasons and having regard to all matters raised, I conclude that the proposal accords with the development plan and the appeal should be allowed.

K Williams

INSPECTOR