



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 February 2025

by N Armstrong BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27th March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W0734/D/24/3355004

8 Glenfield Drive, Middlesbrough TS5 7PX

- 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 Mrs Iram Shehzadi against the decision of Middlesbrough Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/0204/FUL.
 - The development is described as “retrospective application for a double storey rear extension comprising: A lounge and kitchen at GF. A two bedroom ext at FF”.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development in the banner heading above is taken from the application form. However, the proposal could be accurately summarised as a retrospective application for the erection of a two storey extension to the rear.
3. I observed at the site visit that there is a two storey extension on the rear elevation of the property. It is clear from the plans and evidence that this is the structure referenced in the planning application, although the roof material that has been used differs from that stated in the application form. I also saw that a rooflight had been installed within the rear facing roof slope of the original dwelling that is not shown on the plans. I have dealt with the appeal on the basis that planning permission is being sought retrospectively for the construction of the extension.
4. The name on the appeal form differs from that entered on the planning application form. The appellant’s agent has clarified that the appeal should proceed under the name used in the banner heading.

Main Issues

5. The main issues are the effect of the development on:
 - the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area; and
 - the living conditions of the occupants of 10 Glenfield Drive, with particular reference to outlook, daylight and sunlight.

Reasons

Character and appearance

6. The appeal property comprises a two storey, semi-detached dwelling within a neighbourhood containing houses of similar age and appearance. The two storey extension has replaced a smaller single storey offshoot but has a much larger footprint extending the full width of the property. The plans show an extension projecting 5.4 metres from the rear wall of the main property.
7. The design makes some attempt at subservience, the roof of the extension having been set down below the main ridge. Nevertheless, the scale and proportions of the extension make it a bulky structure. Its scale overwhelms the original building, dominating the rear elevation of the property. Moreover, the gabled roof form is out of keeping with the hipped roofs which characterise the host property and buildings in the wider area. The choice of materials, which are a poor match for those of the existing building, draws attention to what is an already incongruous addition.
8. The extension is visible from surrounding streets, including from Glenfield Road, where there are views of the side elevation, and from Tollesby Road and Glaisdale Avenue. Trees in rear gardens are ineffective in screening the development and do not mitigate its poor design. Rebuilding in matching materials would not make the development acceptable as the excessive scale and discordant roof design would still be harmful.
9. Accordingly, I conclude that the development is harmful to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. It therefore conflicts with Policies CS5 and DC1 of the Middlesbrough Local Development Framework Core Strategy (2008) (the CS). Amongst other things, these policies seek to secure a high quality of design which contributes to the character of the area, including with regard to visual appearance and the relationship with the surrounding area in terms of scale, design and materials.

Living conditions

10. I viewed the extension from the rear garden of the appeal site, as well as from the interior and rear garden of the adjoining property at 10 Glenfield Drive. The neighbouring property has rear facing sliding doors serving a primary room at ground floor level close to the extension. A single storey off-shoot is also located to part of its rear elevation.
11. Due to its position and substantial projection, the development is contrary to Middlesbrough's Urban Design Supplementary Planning Document (2013) (SPD), which states that such extensions should be restricted to no more than 3 metres in length and set in off the common boundary by 2.5 metres. The SPD also states that first floor extensions above the footprint of the original kitchen off-shoot should be restricted to the original projection of the off-shoot, which is generally 3 metres in length. As a result of its scale and projection, the extension is excessive in length, is significantly overbearing and adversely impacts on the outlook from the ground floor opening on No 10 nearest to the boundary. The position of the rear off-shoot to No 10 also results in a more enclosed outlook and tunnelling effect for that room alongside the substantial two storey extension. This would cause unacceptable harm to the outlook from the affected room.

12. Whilst I have not been provided with any technical assessment in respect of daylight and sunlight, due to its position and scale, there is a high probability that the extension has resulted in some loss of daylight and overshadowing to the ground floor primary room to the rear of No 10. This adds to the harm arising from the loss of outlook.
13. I conclude that due to its projection, height and proximity to the boundary, the development has a significant adverse effect on the living conditions of the occupants at 10 Glenfield Drive. This conflicts with Policy DC1 of the CS, which amongst other things looks to ensure that the effect on amenities of occupiers of neighbouring properties will be minimal.

Other Matters

14. I noted other two storey rear extensions in the surrounding area, including at the adjacent property at 6 Glenfield Drive. However, these are not comparable to the appeal proposal in terms of their scale, design and impacts on neighbouring properties, therefore I cannot draw any direct comparison that would weigh in favour of the appeal scheme. The presence of these does not justify the harm that I have found.
15. Representations from neighbours in support of the development were submitted at the planning application stage. I have taken account of these comments, but they do not alter my conclusions on the main issues.
16. The appellant's statement refers to expense, distress and inconvenience in the event the appeal is dismissed. However, these are not matters that I can consider under this planning appeal and do not alter my findings, in which I have had regard solely to the planning merits of the development.

Conclusion

17. 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