



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 February 2025

by F Harrison BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4th March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W0734/D/24/3355717

69 Saxonfield, Middlesbrough TS8 0SN

- 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 Jonathan Phillips against the decision of Middlesbrough Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/0230/FUL.
 - The development proposed is described as extend the existing attached garage to be in line with the front elevation of the main building, build new attached garage to the south-east corner of the plot.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area, including the appeal property.

Reasons

3. The appeal site accommodates a detached dwelling on a corner plot within a residential street. Despite the variety of types of dwellings in the surrounding area, the similarity in the general scale of the built form creates a sense of balance and a harmonious character and appearance that contributes positively to the area.
4. The proposal would extend and convert the existing garage to provide a playroom, and would introduce a new garage, attached to the other side of the appeal property, to securely store vehicles as the size of the existing garage is said to be unsuitable. Despite the use of materials to match which would help to assimilate the proposal with the appeal property and the surrounding area, the scale of the proposed extensions and alterations are such that they would not be subservient to the existing property, as advised in Middlesbrough's Urban Design Supplementary Planning Document (2013) (SPD).
5. The partial hipped roof design of the proposed playroom attempts to offer an element of consistent design with the surrounding hipped roof garages. However, it does not extend the full depth of the extension and in any event, owing to the proposed parapet wall, in oblique views from Saxonfield it would have the appearance of a flat roof. In doing so it would have an awkward presence with the neighbouring hipped roof garage at 70 Saxonfield. The irregular shape, extensive depth and flat roof of the proposed garage would result in a bulky addition. Furthermore, the position of the garage door at right angles to the main elevation would have a poor degree of integration with the appeal property.

6. The proposed garage would not be seen in the context of other flat roof extensions, as such it would draw the eye and unbalance the prevailing character and appearance of the area where hipped roofed garages predominate. Furthermore, the parapet wall increases the height of the garage and would not reflect the modest scale of neighbouring garages. Despite the corner plot location, the proposed garage would be conspicuous in views on approach from the north-east along Saxonfield.
7. While other dwellings in the surrounding area have been altered and extended, I did not observe any properties that have been extended in a similar way to the appeal scheme. Overall, the proposal would not have a consistent design with surrounding properties and would therefore look out of place in the street, contrary to the SPD guidance for householder development.
8. For the reasons given, the proposal would be unduly harmful to the character and appearance of the area, including the appeal property and would conflict with Policies DC1 and CD5 of the Middlesbrough Local Development Framework Core Strategy (2008) (CS). Amongst other things, these policies require that proposals secure a high standard of design, including its visual appearance, layout and relationship with surrounding area in terms of scale, which should be well integrated with the immediate context.
9. The decision notice refers to CS Policy DC1 criterion d which relates to highway safety. The reasons for this are unclear as the officer report concludes that there would be no undue harm to highway safety, and I agree. As such this part of Policy DC1 has not been determinative in this appeal.

Other Matters

10. While the appellant has expressed frustrations with the Council's handling of the case, this does not alter or outweigh my findings which are based on the planning merits of this case.

Conclusion

11. My above findings bring the proposal into conflict with the development plan, read as a whole. There are no material considerations that indicate a decision should be made other than in accordance with it. Therefore, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

F Harrison

INSPECTOR