
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 February 2020

by T J Burnham BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27th February 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/J4525/D/20/3245179

27 Dovedale Road, Sunderland SR6 8LP

- 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 & Mrs Matthew & Rebecca Blyth against the decision of Sunderland City Council.
 - The application Ref 19/01584/FUL, dated 18 September 2019, was refused by notice dated 21 November 2019.
 - The development proposed is the construction of a bedroom over the existing garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the construction of a bedroom over the existing garage at 27 Dovedale Road, Sunderland SR6 8LP in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 19/01584/FUL, dated 18 September 2019, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Site Location Plan & Drawings 0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11 & 12.
 - 3) The external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the construction of the host property.

Procedural Matter

2. The Sunderland City Council Core Strategy and Development Plan (2020) (CSDP) was adopted by the Council on 30 January 2020. I am required to make my decision based on the policy in place at the time of the decision.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and area.

Reasons

4. The area is residential in nature and is in the main formed of semi-detached dwellings. The proposal seeks the provision of an additional bedroom above the existing garage through an extension at first floor level. Some nearby properties have been extended in a manner which is similar to that proposed.

5. Guidance within the SPD¹ relating to side extensions suggests that they should usually incorporate a pitched roof or a roof slope and shape that matches the existing property. It also suggests that two storey side extensions should incorporate a front wall set back by not less than 1m from that of the original building, partly to avoid any terracing effect.
6. Whilst the roof of the extension would not replicate the hipped roof of the main dwelling, the proposal would include a pitched roof which would sit well below the main ridgeline. The result would be a low-key roof form which would be subordinate to the host property. Although a 1m set back from the front wall of the original building is not proposed, a slight in set would be provided such that it would assist in enabling the extension to form a secondary and subordinate element of the dwelling.
7. Given that neither 25 or 31 Dovedale Road have two storey side extensions, any terracing effect would be very minor and any limited impact in this respect would be reduced by the set down to the ridgeline of the extension and its slight set back. I also note that the SPD provides guidance only and indicates that side extensions should be assessed on their individual merits. With this in mind, I note that several dwellings within the immediate area have been extended in similar ways to that which is the subject of this appeal, including the neighbouring property at No. 29 with which the proposal would largely match up with.
8. As a result, the proposal would not detract from the character and appearance of the existing dwelling or the surrounding area. It would therefore accord with Policy BH1 of the CSDP which amongst other things requires that to achieve high quality design development should be of a scale, massing, layout and appearance which respects and enhances the positive qualities of nearby properties and the locality. Although it does not fully accord with the terms of the SPD guidance, I have assessed the proposal on its individual merits. The proposal would not conflict with the aims of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Conditions

9. Planning permission is granted subject to the standard three year time limit. It is necessary that the development be carried out in accordance with the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of certainty. Matching materials are required to ensure a complementary relationship with the host dwelling and the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed subject to the conditions.

T J Burnham

INSPECTOR

¹ Sunderland City Council Household Alterations and Extensions Supplementary Planning Document 2010