



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 October 2019

by J Hunter BA (Hons) Msc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15th November 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/J4525/W/19/3226007

120 Stridingedge, Washington, Tyne and Wear NE37 1HJ

- 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 Stephen Nicholson against the decision of Sunderland City Council.
 - The application Ref 18/02138/FUL, dated 20 December 2018, was refused by notice dated 8 February 2019.
 - The development proposed is change from open space to private garden, to include a low boundary fence with enclosed flowerbeds, plus a high enclosed boundary gate to the height of the existing boundary.
-

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 area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a narrow strip of land measuring approximately 1 metre by 6 metres adjoining the rear boundary of the host property No 120 Stridingedge. The host property is a terraced house with an enclosed rear garden which backs onto an area of open space.
4. The proposed development would change the use of the appeal site by taking it into the private outdoor amenity space associated with the host property. In addition, the development would include the introduction of enclosed flowerbeds and an enclosed boundary gate into the rear garden.
5. The character of the immediate surrounding area is densely developed residential units arranged in short linear streets and cul-de-sacs but punctuated by small enclaves of open space that are connected by footways. The appeal site and host property look onto one such open space on the edge of the estate.
6. The host property sits within a terrace that is consistent with the prevailing character of the area that is very uniform in design, laid out in a strong linear format. The rear gardens of the properties follow the pattern of development

and are all of very similar size and enclosed by solid boundary treatments of approximately 1.8 metres in height.

7. The proposal would introduce a feature that would project out from the established fence line and into the open space area. The result would be an alien and incongruous feature that would be harmful to the prevailing character of the area.
8. I note that the appellant states that there are other similar developments within the vicinity however, I have not been provided with any evidence of this and I did not see any similar developments whilst on my site visit. Nevertheless, the presence of similar development does not justify further harm.
9. I conclude that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the area and thereby conflict with the requirements of saved policies B2 and B3 of the City of Sunderland Unitary Development Plan 1998 (UDP) which require development proposals to, amongst other things, respect and enhance local character.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons set out above and taking into account all other matters, I conclude the appeal should be dismissed.

J Hunter

INSPECTOR