



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 March 2025

by N Armstrong BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/H0738/D/24/3355843

51 Goose Pasture, Yarm, Stockton-on-Tees TS15 9EP

- 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 Dean Fitzmaurice against the decision of Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/0532/FUL.
 - The development proposed is demolition of attached garage, construction of two storey front and side extensions, single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The appeal proposals include development that is not part of the Council's reason for refusal, nor does the Council identify any conflict with the development plan in relation to these aspects of the application. Following my site visit I see no reason to disagree. Therefore, the focus of this appeal is the proposed two storey front extension as referred to in the Council's decision notice.
3. An amended proposed elevations plan was submitted during the course of the planning application showing a change to the roof design of the front extension and a slight alteration to its position on the front elevation. The Council made its decision against the revised plan, and I have made my determination on the same basis. I note that whilst the proposed elevations plan was revised, the proposed floor plans drawing that I have been provided with does not reflect the change in position of the front extension where it is set in from the side elevation of the original dwelling. However, I have enough detail before me to form the basis of my overall planning assessment. Had I been allowing the appeal I would have pursued this matter further with the parties.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area, with particular reference to the two storey front extension.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a detached dwelling that sits in a generous plot within a residential area. Along with other properties, it is set down at a lower level from the highway that provides access to Goose Pasture. The property is located to the southern part of Goose Pasture, which is characterised by a smaller group of two

storey detached dwellings of varying layout and appearance that form a street frontage. The dwellings are predominantly constructed with red brick and concrete roof tiles. The front elevations of properties in this area are set back from and face towards the estate road and an embankment beyond with mature trees, whilst the rear gardens are bound by the River Tees. The northern part of Goose Pasture comprises a larger group of detached dwellings with varying designs and the layout set on both sides of the estate road. There are also variations in the materials used, including predominantly red and buff brick with some elements of timber cladding. Views of the appeal property and other dwellings in this street frontage are very limited from outside of Goose Pasture.

6. Due to the extent of its projection, width and the overall scale and massing, the proposal would be a substantial two-storey extension to the front of the property. This would be an incongruous addition out of scale and character with the existing property and would have a detrimental visual impact in the immediate area. Although the property is set back from and at a lower level to the estate road, and there are existing hedges to the front boundaries, the extension would be clearly visible from the road and footpath and would adversely impact on the street scene in this part of the estate. In terms of other aspects of the design, whilst a hipped roof can help to reduce the bulk of an extension, I note this is not entirely consistent with the appearance of the appeal property and it does little to reduce the dominance of the extension on the front elevation.
7. I have had regard to the Council's Householder Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (2021) (the SPD), and in particular its guidance on front extensions. The immediate area of the appeal site features a staggered and indistinct building line, and in such circumstances the SPD states front extensions are more likely to be appropriate. However, for the reasons set out above, the proposal would not complement the area, match the design features of the original property or avoid being obtrusive.
8. There are variations to the front of properties close to the appeal site, and the appellant makes specific reference to the extent of the additions to the front of 49 Goose Pasture. I noted these were single storey extensions, albeit covering more of the front elevation than the appeal proposal. I do not know the circumstances under which these extensions were constructed or their status with regard to planning permission. As such, they do not provide justification for the effects of the appeal scheme or provide a reason to alter my findings.
9. There is no uniform character in terms of design, and extensions have altered the front elevations of other properties in the immediate area to varying degrees, including some to a much lesser extent than the proposed scheme. However, the proposed development would result in harm due to the overall scale, massing and design as a two storey addition on the front elevation. I therefore cannot draw any direct comparison from other properties with the proposal that would weigh in its favour. The presence of these other examples and variations in design do not justify the harm that I have otherwise found.
10. I conclude that the proposed two storey front extension would be materially harmful to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. This conflicts with Policies SD3 and SD8 of the Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council Local Plan (2019). Amongst other things, these seek to ensure extensions are in keeping with the property and the street scene, and new development will

be designed to the highest possible standard, taking into account the context of the surrounding area. The proposal also conflicts with the SPD for the reasons set out above.

Other Matters

11. I have taken account of the appellant's statement, which sets out their desire for additional space. I also acknowledge the suggested benefits associated with a larger home within the local housing stock, as well as the suggested economic, social and environmental objectives. However, it has not been adequately demonstrated that the development as proposed is the only way to achieve those objectives. In any event, the stated benefits do not outweigh the harm I have identified or alter my conclusion on the main issue.
12. Where the proposal has been found to be acceptable in other respects, for example in terms of flood risk and parking, these are neutral matters and do not weigh in favour of the development.

Conclusion

13. The proposal conflicts with the development plan and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal is dismissed.

N Armstrong

INSPECTOR