



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 July 2013

by M Seaton BSc (Hons) Dip TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 1 August 2013

Appeal Ref: APP/H0738/D/13/2199193

17 Wordsworth Close, Billingham, Cleveland, TS23 3YU

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr C Short against the decision of Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 13/0333/FUL, dated 4 January 2013, was refused by notice dated 2 April 2013.
 - The development proposed is a garage extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a garage extension at 17 Wordsworth Close, Billingham, Cleveland TS23 3YU in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 13/0333/FUL, dated 4 January 2013, subject to the conditions below:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Drawing Numbers 1A and 1C.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the appeal proposal on the character and appearance of the area and the host dwelling.

Reasons

3. The proposed development is recessed back from the street in the corner plot of a cul-de-sac within a large residential development. The prevailing character of the development is of two-storey detached dwellings located close together with limited gaps and views between. The appeal site does not occupy a prominent position within the street scene.
4. The proposed extension would infill the gap between the dwelling and the existing garage block, and would result in a single-storey, 4-bay garage building. The sense of openness in this part of the street scene is not defined by the gap between the existing garages and the dwelling, but by the visual relief that the single-storey garages provide from the prevailing two-storey scale of development within the area. The proposed extension would not erode

the sense of openness and would maintain the visual relief that the existing single-storey garages provide. Furthermore, whilst the extension would be attached to the front elevation of the host dwelling, given the position and layout of the dwelling and relationship with the existing garage block, it would not interrupt an established building line or appear as an obtrusive or incongruous form of development. The proposed garage door would be wider than those adjoining, but given its position the difference in size would not appear incongruous. The overall scale and form of the extension would be in keeping with the existing garage block and the use of matching materials would help to assimilate it with the existing development.

5. For these reasons, the proposed development would not have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the area or the host dwelling. I therefore conclude that the development would not conflict with policy HO12 of the Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council Local Plan (2006), policy CS3 of the Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2010), or Supplementary Planning Guidance Note 2: Householder Extension Guide (2004). These policies and guidance seek to ensure that householder extensions are not obtrusive and are in keeping with the street scene. Furthermore, the proposed development would not conflict with the objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework, which seek to protect against development of poor design.

Conditions

6. The Council has suggested a number of conditions which it considers would be appropriate were the appeal to be allowed. I have considered these below in the light of Circular 11/95.
7. In the interest of proper planning, conditions relating to timeliness and the identification of plans would be necessary. A condition relating to the use of matching materials would also ensure that the finish and colour of the proposed garage would complement the appearance of the existing dwelling and would not harm the character of the local area.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal should be allowed subject to the conditions listed.

M Seaton

INSPECTOR