



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 April 2012

by Philip Major BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 30 April 2012

Appeal Ref: APP/W0734/D/12/2171552

10 Ravenscroft Avenue, MIDDLESBROUGH, TS5 7QL

- 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 S Ahmed against the decision of Middlesbrough Council.
 - The application Ref M/FP/1108/11/P was refused by notice dated 24 January 2012.
 - The development proposed is first floor bedroom extension, ground floor single storey extension and alterations to garage.
-

Preliminary Matter

1. My site visit was arranged as an 'access required site visit'. When I arrived at the property I found a note pinned to the door of the house explaining that the rear gate had been left open for access. There was therefore no need to disturb the appellant or his representative. I was able to view the property in sufficient detail, including a visit to the adjacent house, to enable me to reach a decision.

Decision

2. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issue

3. The main issue in the appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of the adjacent occupants.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a modest semi detached house which has been altered and extended. The fact that it is located on a corner plot means that the alterations have been capable of being accommodated without the plot becoming overcrowded with buildings. For the same reason the extensions now proposed are physically capable of being assimilated into the site.
5. The single storey side extension, which would link the house and garage, would have limited impact when viewed from the street. In my judgement there is no reason why this element of the proposal could not be successfully incorporated into the buildings on site. It would be low enough not to cause any difficulties to neighbours, and its design is appropriate for its location. A condition could be imposed which would ensure that materials matched those of the existing house.

6. The first floor extension would be more problematic. It would sit on top of an existing ground floor extension, and together with the existing flat roofed first floor extension to which it would be attached, would extend a significant distance into the rear garden of the property. This would result in a substantial and tall brick façade facing the boundary with No 12 Ravenscroft Avenue.
7. The combination of the 2 flat roofed elements, at slightly different heights, and their combined extent of plain unrelieved brickwork, would introduce a dominating feature close to the common boundary with No 12. Given the orientation of the properties it is likely that the proposed extension would also reduce the sunlight available in the garden of No 12, and make it a less pleasant place to be. There would also be some reduction in daylight to the rear room of the house. In my judgement these effects would amount to a significant and unacceptable reduction in the living conditions of the occupants of that property.
8. I acknowledge that there would be new first floor windows facing No 8, but that it is proposed that these be obscure glazed. As such there would be no additional and unacceptable overlooking of that property.
9. Middlesbrough Local Development Framework Core Strategy DC1 requires, amongst other things, that new development minimises any effect on the amenities of occupiers of nearby properties. As a result of the adverse impact identified the proposed development, so far as it relates to the proposed first floor extension, would be in conflict with this policy.
10. I therefore find the proposed ground floor extension to be acceptable, but the first floor extension to be unacceptable. However, the extensions would share a common wall to some extent and it would therefore be inappropriate to issue a split decision in this case. Hence, for the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Philip Major

INSPECTOR