



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 May 2025

by K L Robbie BA (Hons) DipTP MTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 May 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/V0728/D/25/3363621

26 Kings Close, Lazenby, Redcar and Cleveland TS6 8FA

- 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 Nylle Wheeler against the decision of Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council.
 - The application reference is R/2024/0679/FF.
 - The development proposed is a detached garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the site and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. Kings Close is a residential cul-de-sac consisting of modern two storey detached and semi-detached properties with open frontages on the edge of an established residential area. In general garages on the close have pitched roofs and are discreetly positioned to the side of properties at the end of driveways and are therefore inconspicuous in the street scene.
4. 26 Kings Close is prominently located and is visible from the junction with Pasture Lane. The proposed garage would be located within an open front garden and parking area and would be forward of the front elevations of 27 – 29 Kings Close. As a result, it would be highly prominent within the street scene. Whilst it would be set back from the edge of the highway, it would dominate the front garden of the appeal property and the street scene. Furthermore, it would have a hipped roof which would be at odds with the host property and the prevailing character of the close where hipped roofs are not a common feature.
5. Consequently, the proposal would be an incongruous addition which would harm the character and appearance of the site and its surroundings in conflict with Policy SD4 of the Redcar and Cleveland Local Plan 2018 which seeks to ensure that development is of a high standard.

Conclusion

6. For the reasons set out above, the proposal is contrary to the development plan. I therefore conclude that the appeal is dismissed.

K L Robbie

INSPECTOR