



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: 05 February 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W0734/D/24/3350996

7 Nuneaton Drive, Hemlington, Middlesbrough TS8 9PR

- 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 Mr Ian Broomhead against the decision of Middlesbrough Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/0221/FUL.
 - The development proposed is single storey front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. I am the Inspector appointed to determine a similar appeal on the adjoining semi-detached property at 9 Nuneaton Drive¹. The appeals raise similar issues but are the subject of separate decisions. As such there may be some duplication on matters including the consideration of planning policy.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are:
 - the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the host property and the area; and
 - the effect of the proposal upon highway safety.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal site comprises a left hand side brick semi-detached property. It is positioned at an angle, thus bringing it forward of neighbouring properties. The existing dwelling, like its adjoining neighbour at No 9, has a modest front porch. The existing porch is positioned slightly off from the mid-way point of the properties with space to either side. The overall design and scale of the proposal, which seeks to add a front extension matches No 9, which it would adjoin. Front porches and bay windows are very common features in the immediate area. Although their size and design vary the majority do not extend across the full width of the front elevation. Therefore, although there are a variety of differing house types, together they generally have a commonality. This is an attribute of the character of the area and provides cohesion to its visual appearance.

¹ Appeal Ref: APP/W073/D/24/3351491

5. The proposal seeks to increase the amount of development at the front of the property. It would be deeper than the existing porch and extend across the full width of the dwelling. This would not be reflective of other similar properties in the area. It would diminish the contribution of the generally consistently sized front projections have on the pattern of development and layout of the area. The depth of the proposal would also bring development closer to the road. Given the position and angled siting of the host dwelling it would be prominent and incongruous within the streetscene. As this would not be a limited form of front extension the proposal would conflict with the aims of the Middlesbrough Urban Design Supplementary Planning Document adopted January 2013.
6. Furthermore, as there are numerous properties with similar features, there is a reasonable prospect of similar development being repeated nearby as they could be extended in a similar way. Although proposals are considered on their own merit, in this case if similar development were to be often repeated, the cumulative effect would cause further harm to the character of the area through the erosion of the space between properties resulting in a more built up layout.
7. Notwithstanding there is a similar proposal for No 9 before me, I cannot be certain that either proposal would be built together. I am not of the view that this would be a reasonable condition to impose on either appellant. However, I must also consider this aspect. Taking them both into account there would be further harm resulting from the additional combined bulk of two larger front extensions, which together would also be unduly large and out of character for the area. Thus harm individually and in combination would arise.
8. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore conflict 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.

Highway Safety

9. Nuneaton Drive serves a number of homes and provides access to Hemlington Lake. The appeal property is located quite close to the junction with Hemlington Hall Road and on a slight bend in the road. The Council has advised that the Tees Valley Design Guide advises that two car parking spaces (2.4m x 4.8m min) are required for a three bedroomed property. Although it is understood that the area in front of the property would be hard paved, and the proposed depth of the extension has been reduced, there are no plans before me which show the dimensions or manoeuvring areas for the parking.
10. However, although on-street parking could affect general manoeuvring, from my observations the road environment was not heavily trafficked and I did not observe on-street parking capacity to be limited. There are no double yellow lines on the road and therefore vehicles could park in this location at this current time. The speed of the road is restricted to 20mph. I have not been provided with any parking analysis, accident records or the views of the Local Highway Authority. Therefore, whilst the absence of details to comprehensively show parking could be accommodated on site is a detractor of the scheme, there is no substantive evidence before me that on-street parking would be harmful to highway safety.

11. In the absence of substantive evidence to the contrary I conclude that the proposal would not be harmful highway safety. The proposal would therefore accord with Local Plan Policy DC1, where it seeks to ensure no impact on highway safety.

Other Matters

12. The appellant would benefit from the proposal. It would enhance the living environment and provide more adaptable accommodation for the future. However, I only have limited information in this regard. It is not clear if a similar amount of space could be achieved through other less harmful additions to the property. Whilst I have sympathy with this situation, ultimately this is a private matter of limited weight and does not outweigh the harm.
13. I have been provided with numerous examples of other properties, with front extensions. I have no addresses for these and extent of the photographs limits how much of each building and area I can see. I therefore cannot be certain that these are sufficiently similar to warrant a different conclusion.
14. I appreciate the appellant's frustration regarding correspondence with the Council. However, this is not a matter before me and has no bearing on the appeal.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons given above, the proposal is contrary to the development plan. I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

K Williams

INSPECTOR

