



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 August 2025

by Mrs Chris Pipe BA(Hons), DipTP, MTP, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W0734/D/25/3367277

7 Kensington Road, Middlesbrough TS5 6AJ

- 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 Ash Mahmood against the decision of Middlesbrough Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/0130/FUL.
 - The development proposed is dormer extension to front.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The Council changed the description of development from that referenced in the application form. I note that the appellant also uses this on the appeal submission, I have adopted the revised description of development.
3. There appears to be a discrepancy with the proposed plans which detail a difference in proposed height of the development on the front and side elevations. The Planning Appeal Statement submitted by the appellant confirms that the height detailed in the side elevation was incorrect and that the proposed development would be lower than the existing roof ridge. I have taken into account the appellants comments. Notwithstanding this inconsistency, I consider that in this instance a condition could be attached to any approval to ensure the elevations are consistent as the modification would not materially alter the proposal.
4. The Council's reason for refusal refers to the Middlesbrough Publication Local Plan (2025) (the Publication Local Plan). Whilst this emerging plan appears to be at an advanced stage of preparation, I cannot give it full weight. Nevertheless, it is a material consideration that I have had regard to in reaching my decision.

Main Issue

5. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host property and area in general.

Reasons

6. The appeal site is a mid-terraced property within a predominantly residential area. Properties within the terrace have an architectural harmony, which includes for the majority of properties modest singular front dormers. Whilst window detailing, cladding and in some instance roof detailing differ in terms of the dormers, the

consistency of scale and positioning creates a uniformed appearance adding to the character and appearance of the area.

7. The proposed materials are intended to match those used on the existing building and the surrounding properties in an effort to integrate the proposed development with its setting. Notwithstanding this I find that the proposed development would be an incongruous addition to the streetscene.
8. I understand that the proposed development has undergone revisions in an attempt to mitigate the effect of the development by providing dormers connected by a setback central roof link. Nevertheless, the scale and design of the proposed development would be dominant and inconsistent to the built form of the terrace, resulting in an interruption to the architectural rhythm.
9. I find that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the host property and area in general. There is conflict with Policies DC1 and CS5 of the Middlesbrough Local Development Framework, Core Strategy (2008) and Policies CR2 and CR3 of the Publication Local Plan which amongst other things seeks to ensure developments are of high quality and well-integrated with the immediate and wider context.
10. There is conflict with the Middlesbrough's Urban Design Guide, Supplementary Planning Document (2013) which amongst other things seeks to ensure the visual impact of dormer extensions is minimised.
11. There is also conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework (2024) which seeks to ensure developments are of good design appropriate and sympathetic to their surroundings.

Conclusion

12. For the above reasons I conclude that this appeal should be dismissed.

Chris Pipe

INSPECTOR