



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: 6 February 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/V0728/D/24/3350255

18 Woodbrook Close, New Marske, Redcar TS11 8HP

- 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 Craig Lawton against the decision of Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is R/2024/0106/FF.
 - The development proposed is single storey extension to rear of existing detached house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of the occupiers of 16 Woodbrook Close.

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises the property and grounds of 18 Woodbrook Close. This two-storey detached dwelling is located within a residential area. The character and layout of homes feel relatively compact, and No 18 is very close to the adjacent property at No 16. The appeal property is set back within the road turning head. Therefore this two-storey property already projects beyond No 16 along and close proximity to the shared side boundary.
4. The proposed rear lean-to extension would extend a further 3.9m from the rear of the host dwelling. The proposal would therefore result in built development projecting nearly the full length of the side boundary of No 16. The proposal would consist of a massing of a blank brick wall, with an initial height above 3m. Although the height of the roof reduces, the lowest part would still be above the 1.8m close boarded boundary fence.
5. Due to the additional height, depth, and mass, occupiers of No 16 would therefore look out across predominantly blank brick elevation. Even with lowered floor levels and altered roof pitch given the above coupled with the close position and presence of the existing two-storey element of No 18, I find that that the proposal would have an unacceptably enclosing and dominating impact on the outlook of the occupiers of No 16. This would be the case particularly when experienced from the rooms served by ground floor windows and garden, making them less pleasant to use as a result.

6. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposal would be significantly harmful to the living conditions of the occupiers of No 16. The proposal therefore conflicts with Policy SD4 of the Redcar and Cleveland Local Plan, adopted May 2018. This requires development in general to meet design principles to ensure that it will not have a significant adverse impact on the amenities of occupiers of existing and buildings. For similar reasons it would also conflict with the aims of the Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document , May 2013, where it seeks to ensure development does not result in unacceptable effects for the occupiers of adjacent properties.

Other Matters

7. While it may be the case that there are some homes in the area which have extensions along the boundary, this does not in itself justify further harm. However, I have not been provided with full details and they will have been determined under a different set of circumstances, planning policies and other evidence which is not before me in this appeal. There is a degree of subjectivity in consideration of these matters and such schemes require site specific judgements to be made, and for these reasons I attach limited weight to this.
8. While I acknowledge that neighbours have not objected, I am required to be mindful of the effects of the proposal over its lifetime. The absence of objections therefore carries little weight in my determination.
9. The proposal would be of a suitable design The proposal would also have benefits for the appellant. However, I have very little information in respect of this, but ultimately this is a private benefit of limited weight and does not outweigh the harm.

Conclusion

10. The proposed development conflicts with the development plan when considered as a whole. There are no material considerations, either individually or in combination, that outweigh the identified harm and associated development plan conflict.
11. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

K Williams

INSPECTOR