



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 May 2018

by **Elaine Gray MA(Hons) MSc IHBC**

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

Decision date: 30 May 2018

Appeal Ref: APP/W0734/D/18/3195031

48 Cawood Drive, Middlesbrough TS5 7JP

- 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 Hugh Hooley against the decision of Middlesbrough Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 17/0604/FUL, dated 27 September 2017, was refused by notice dated 11 January 2018.
 - The development is proposed garage and proposed boundary wall.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a single-storey dwelling at the end of a terrace of similar residences. The proposal would create a new boundary wall to the property, and a side extension to accommodate a new garage.
4. The Council's document entitled 'Middlesbrough's Urban Design – Supplementary Planning Document' (SPD) sets out the basic principles that apply to extensions. It states that new design should be consistent, so that the pitch and design of the roof matches the existing. The terrace of three dwellings, including No 48, has gabled roofs at either end, whereas the roof of the new extension would be hipped. It would therefore fail to reflect the characteristic roof form of No 48 and its immediate neighbours.
5. The SPD also states that designs should be subservient, and of a scale that is appropriate to the existing building. The extension would rise to match the existing ridge height of the dwelling, and would run in line with its front and rear elevations. By matching the dimensions of the main house in this way, the proposal would fail to achieve a sufficient degree of visual subservience to the existing dwelling. The incongruous hipped roof would be further accentuated by this lack of subservience, thus materially harming the appearance of No 48.
6. The appellant has made reference to planning permissions that have been granted for bungalows in the area. Although the details of these cases are not

before me, the new bungalows would undoubtedly be greater in size than the proposed garage. However, this does not negate the need for all development proposals to be assessed against the relevant policy requirements, which include the need for sympathetic design.

7. No 48 occupies a corner on the junction with Muston Close. The SPD advises that corner plots occupying sensitive locations within streetscapes will require careful attention to design, in order to preserve appropriate areas of open space. The property has an existing boundary fence which is positioned so as to leave a strip of grass between it and the pavement edge. Although it is small, this land provides a natural green buffer which softens the edge of the property. It thus contributes positively to the spacious character of the surroundings, which are characterised by open areas laid to grass.
8. The new wall would step out to meet the back of the pavement, thus removing the strip of grass. It would bring the built form significantly closer to the road, and so the development would substantially reduce the more open character around the junction. It would erode the contribution of the existing soft landscaping to the pleasant ambiance of the area, thus unacceptably harming its character and appearance.
9. I have been directed to other walls in the area that are similar in design and location to that proposed in this case, one at the junction of Cawood Drive and Glendale Road, and one at the junction of Cawood Drive and Cranswick Drive. However, I saw that these developments have resulted in a hard, permanent edge to the boundaries that is at odds with the prevailing openness of the area. In any event, generous corner plots next to junctions remain characteristic and neither of these existing developments can justify the harm identified.
10. I understand the appellant's feelings of unfairness in relation to these other permissions. However, these permissions do not outweigh the further harm that would arise from the proposal.
11. Drawing the above factors together, I conclude that the proposed development would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area. It would thus conflict with Policy DC1 of the Middlesbrough Local Development Framework Core Strategy (CS), insofar as it requires that the visual appearance and layout of the development and its relationship with the surrounding area in terms of scale and design will be of a high quality, and CS Policy CSS, which amongst other things, seeks to secure a high standard of design for development.
12. For the reasons above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Elaine Gray

INSPECTOR