

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 October 2016

by David Cross BA (Hons), PGDip, MRTPI

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

Decision date: 3 November 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/A4520/D/16/3155404
38 Romsey Drive, Boldon Colliery NE35 9NA

- 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 Ray Canham against the decision of South Tyneside Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref ST/0292/16/HFUL, dated 1 April 2016, was refused by notice dated 26 July 2016.
 - The development proposed is single storey front lounge extension, 2 storey side extension – kitchen extension to ground floor level and first floor bedroom/bathroom over existing garage, and single storey rear dining room extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for single storey front lounge extension, 2 storey side extension – kitchen extension to ground floor level and first floor bedroom/bathroom over existing garage, and single storey rear dining room extension at 38 Romsey Drive, Boldon Colliery NE35 9NA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref ST/0292/16/HFUL, dated 1 April 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: site/roof plan – existing, site/roof plan – proposed, Drg No 0794/5628/628, Drg No 1, Drg No 2.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those on the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the dwelling and its surroundings.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two storey detached dwelling with a garage to the side. It is located on a residential estate which contains dwellings of various designs. The proposal consists of a number of extensions to the ground floor
-

- and a two storey extension to the side. The two storey extension would be above and to the rear of an existing garage and utility room.
4. The Council's Supplementary Planning Document 9 : Householder Developments 2014 (SPD) states that two storey side extensions should be set back from the front wall of the dwelling and have a lower ridge line. This is to ensure that extensions have a subordinate appearance and to prevent a terracing effect within the street scene. The proposal would not comply with these specifications as the front of the two storey extension would be flush with the main front wall of the house and would continue the ridge line.
 5. However, the host property is a detached dwelling and the proposed extensions would not appear as unduly dominant or out of character with the property or its immediate neighbours. The two storey extension would also step back from the front elevation of the nearest property of 40 Romsey Drive and due to this the proposal would not give rise to the terracing effect which the SPD seeks to prevent. Due to the design and arrangement of the property as well as the variety of housing designs in the area, the proposal would not appear as an inappropriate design in relation to the appeal site or the wider street scene.
 6. I acknowledge that there are other examples of two storey side extensions in the area where the upper floor is set back, including properties on Eastleigh Close which are visible from the rear of the appeal site. However, the appellant has highlighted other properties in the area where extensions are flush with the main front elevation of the host dwelling and which I viewed on my site visit. Due to the variety of designs of extensions in the area I consider that the proposal would not be out of character with the wider area.
 7. In relation to other elements of the proposal, the Council state that the ground floor extensions would be acceptable in relation to the amenities of adjacent occupiers and the appearance of the street scene. I agree.
 8. I therefore conclude that the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the dwelling and its surroundings. The proposal would therefore not conflict with Policy DM1(A) of the South Tyneside Development Management Policies 2011 which states that development should be designed to convey sensitive consideration of its surroundings. This policy is broadly consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework in protecting and enhancing the built environment. Whilst the proposal would conflict with the specifications of the SPD, it would comply with the wider aim of the document of encouraging householder developments of an appropriate design.
 9. In addition to the standard 3 year time limitation for commencement, I have imposed a condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the submitted plans. I have also placed a condition on the permission requiring that external materials should match those of the original building in the interests of visual amenity
 10. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

David Cross

INSPECTOR