

SEDGEFIELD BOROUGH COUNCIL

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL
COMMITTEE

5 SEPTEMBER 2006

RECENT PLANNING APPEAL
DECISIONS

Report of Director of Neighbourhood
Services

The following recent planning appeal decisions are reported for the information of the Members:-

AP/2006/0004

The Appeal was made by Mr. Clive Crosby against the Refusal issued by Sedgefield Borough Council for a single storey extension to front of existing garage at 28 Spring Lane Sedgefield.

In the Inspector's decision letter dated 4th September 2006, attached to this report, the Appeal was Upheld.

RECOMMENDATION: That the information be received.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (ACCESS TO INFORMATION) ACT 1985

LIST OF BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS USED IN THE PREPARATION OF REPORT

All relevant Planning Files listed in report.



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 August 2006

by **Christopher John Checkley BA(Hons) MRTPI**

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

The Planning Inspectorate
409 Kite Wing
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Temple Quay
Bristol BS1 6PN
☎ 0117 372 6372
e-mail: enquiries@planning-
inspectorate.gsi.gov.uk

Date: 4 September 2006

Appeal Ref: APP/M1330/A/06/2011631

28 Spring Lane, Sedgefield, Stockton-on-Tees, TS21 2DG

- 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 Clive Crosby against the decision of Sedgefield Borough Council.
- The application (ref. 7/2005/0441/DM), dated 26 June 2005, was refused by notice dated 2 December 2005.
- The development proposed is described in the application as a tiled roof extension to front of existing garage and in the decision notice as a single storey extension to front of existing garage.

Decision

1. For the reasons given below, I allow the appeal and grant planning permission for a single storey extension to front of existing garage in accordance with the terms of the application (ref. 7/2005/0441/DM), dated 26 June 2005, and the plans submitted therewith, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The materials to be used in the construction of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building, including matters of colour, size, shape and texture.

Reasons for the Decision

2. The application site includes one half of several pairs of semi-detached 2-storey dwellings characterised by their hipped roofs and feature bay windows at both ground and first floor levels. A number of the houses have been extended to the side with one or 2-storey additions. The appeal property has a 2-storey side extension that includes an integral garage at ground floor level and accommodation above.
3. Although the proposed extension to the garage would project forward of the main building line, it would be modest - only a single storey and only projecting by about 0.85m - and it would stand broadly in line with the existing bay window. It would also have a tiled roof reflecting the character of the main dwelling. Its proportions and form would be entirely subordinate to the existing house and its architectural style would be in keeping with the existing dwelling. It would enhance the rather bland expanse of front elevation resulting from the 1989 side extension and would not materially unbalance the pair of semi-detached properties. Modest tiled roof garage extensions of this type are already an established part of the local street scene and, in my view, they do not detract from the pleasing appearance

of the dwellings including the feature bay windows. The proposal would largely mirror similar existing extensions including those at the neighbouring pair of dwellings, Numbers 30 and 32 Spring Lane.

4. I conclude that the scheme would have an appropriate scale and design and would be in keeping with the appearance and character of the host dwelling and the street scene of which it forms part. Therefore, there would be no conflict with the relevant provisions of Policies H15 and H16 and Supplementary Planning Guidance Note 4 of the Sedgefield Borough Local Plan adopted in 1996 or the draft Supplementary Planning Document for Residential Extensions (2006) which allows forward projections in exceptional circumstances, which are met here.
5. I consider that the standard condition suggested by the Council regarding compliance with the plans is unnecessary since any material change would not have planning permission. However, I am imposing a condition requiring the use of matching materials in the interests of the appearance of the area. I have taken account of all the other matters raised, but none have led me to a different conclusion.

C J Checkley

INSPECTOR

This page is intentionally left blank