



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 October 2019 by Ifeanyi Chukwujekwu BSc MSc MIEMA
CEnv AssocRTPI

Decision by Chris Preston BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 November 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/A4520/D/19/3235194

53 Whitburn Road, Cleadon, South Tyneside, SR6 7QS

- 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 and Mrs Paul and Michelle Richards against the decision of South Tyneside Council.
 - The application Ref ST/0455/19/HFUL, dated 2 June 2019, was refused by notice dated 6 August 2019.
 - The development proposed is a resubmission of ST/0827/18/HFUL - Demolish existing front porch, demolish existing carport to side of house, and demolish existing rear conservatory and kitchen offshoot. Construct new front porch and carport with canopy roof and first floor side extension (bedrooms and bathroom built over parking area at front and existing structure at rear), and single storey rear family/dining room extension with 2no. rooflights.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matters

3. The Council have found the construction of the front porch and rear extension elements of the scheme to be acceptable, with no anticipated harmful effects upon the character and appearance of the host property or street scene. I find no reason to disagree with this assessment. I shall assess the merits of the scheme before me and proceed on this basis.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is therefore, the effect of the proposed two-storey side extension (bedrooms and bathroom built over parking area at front and existing structure at rear) upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. No. 53 is a semi-detached residential property with an existing open car port structure to the side, and a single storey bedroom extension at the rear. It is

adjoined with no. 55, and together they form one of the pairs of hipped roof semi-detached properties which can be found fronting Whitburn Road. Whitburn Road is an attractive residential street which includes a range of properties, including substantial detached dwellings, semi-detached properties and bungalows. Paired semi-detached dwellings are a distinctive feature of the area which contribute to the overall character, notwithstanding that some properties have been extended in the past.

6. Paragraph 7.3 of the South Tyneside Council Local Development Framework SPD9: Householder Developments (revised January 2014) (the SPD) identifies recommended good practice in relation to two storey side extensions. The proposed side extension would extend to a width which would be significantly greater than the recommended width of three metres or half the width of the host property. The width of the extension would be almost equal to the width of the main body of the dwelling and, accordingly, would not appear subordinate in size and width to the host property. Whilst the attached property at No.55 has been extended previously, the width of the first-floor extension is much more modest than the proposal in this instance which would heavily unbalance the pair of semi-detached dwellings. The modest set-back behind the front elevation and the lower ridgeline would not diminish the harm caused by the overall scale and width of the two-storey addition. The contribution that the pair of semi-detached dwellings make to the appearance of the street scene would be diminished as a result.
7. Paragraph 7.4 of the SPD recognises that there may be circumstances where side extensions of greater width may be acceptable if two or more of four criteria are met. There is a slight stagger in the building line between the appeal property and No.51 and that detached dwelling is of a markedly different design. Given the relationship between those two dwellings the extension would not result in a terracing effect and would be readily distinguishable from the design of No. 51.
8. However, the harmful visual effect relates to the relationship with the attached dwelling at No. 55 and the effect on the balance of the pair. I recognise that both properties have been extended previously and that the size of the two plots is different. Nonetheless, the single storey car port at the appeal site is far less prominent than would be the case for the proposed first floor addition. Even though the plots are of a different width the properties still read as a pair of dwellings and the extensions to date have been subservient to the scale of the original properties such that the overall balance of the pair remains largely intact. That would not be the case for the proposed first floor addition which would not be subservient to the host property and would unbalance the design of the pair. In those circumstances an exception to the general guidance of the SPD would not be warranted.
9. The appellant argues there are similar developments in the locality. It is contended that the proposal is more conservative than these developments. The information provided does not give a clear picture of the circumstances that led to the approval of those developments. I am required to assess the appeal against current planning policy and guidance and each application is considered on its own merits. In that context, the scheme has a visually harmful effect on the residential quality of the street given the overall design and layout of the extension. The existence of other development is not a strong enough reason to justify visually harmful development.

10. I find that by virtue of its excessive width and massing, the proposed side extension would significantly harm the visual appearance of the host dwelling and is inconsistent with the character of the street. Accordingly, there is conflict with the aims and objectives of the NPPF and Policy DM1 of South Tyneside Council's Local Development Framework Development Management Policies (2011), which seek amongst other things to ensure that new development is designed to convey sensitive consideration of its surroundings, and enhance local setting and identity having regard to scale and proportions, form, alignment and use of materials.

Conclusion and Recommendation

11. For the reasons given above and having had regard to evidence before me, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

Ifeanyi Chukwujekwu

APPEALS PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

12. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report, and on that basis, I agree that the appeal should be dismissed.

Chris Preston

INSPECTOR