



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on Tuesday 3 February 2020 by S Witherley

Decision by Chris Preston BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 March 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/A4520/D/19/3239242

161 Victoria Road West, Hebburn, NE31 1UL

- 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 Derek Roberts against the decision of South Tyneside Council
 - The application, Ref ST/0703/19/HFUL, dated 16 August 2019, was refused by notice 11 October 2019.
 - The development proposed as described on the application form is: Resubmission of ST/0496/19/HFUL increasing the set back to the front elevation. First floor side/rear en-suite/bedroom extension over existing lounge/dining room.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for the first floor side/rear en-suite/bedroom extension over existing lounge/dining room, at 161 Victoria Road West, Hebburn, NE31 1UL, in accordance with the terms of the application ST/0703/19/HFUL, dated 16 August 2019, and 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: Drawing No 1 received 16/08/2019, Drawing No. 2 received 16/08/2019, Drawing No 0739-9303-664 Received 16/08/2019, Proposed Site & Roof Plan received 16/08/2019.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development, hereby permitted, shall match those used in the existing building.

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.
 3. The description of the development on the application form is different to that on the Council's decision notice. I have adopted the latter, with a minor change, as this more accurately describes the proposed development.
 4. During the course of the appeal inaccuracies in the submitted drawings were noticed, specifically with regard to the design of the roof. The appellant was written to and given the opportunity to submit revised drawings. These were
-

submitted which corrected the errors on the original plans. The revised drawings corrected a number of discrepancies and did not amend the proposal in a way that would have a materially greater impact on neighbouring properties than the original proposal therefore I am happy they can be considered without causing prejudice to any neighbouring residents.

Main Issue

5. The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the appeal property and surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

6. No. 161 is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling located along Victoria Road West which fronts the busy A185. The appeal property is located between the junctions of Hospital Drive and Burn Heads Road. This stretch of treelined road contains semi-detached properties, the design of which are similar despite minor alterations. The majority of properties have a linked single storey side garage whilst others have replaced these with either a single or double storey side extension. The space between the dwellings contributes to the character of the area.
7. No.161 has a single storey wrap around side and rear extension with a gap that runs along the common boundary with its neighbour at No. 163. The proposal would extend above the ground floor extension at the side and rear. It would be set back from the principal elevation at the front and extend out across part of the existing single storey rear extension. The proposed roof would be hipped and set down from the existing.
8. As a result of the first floor being set back, and the lower roof, the proposal would appear subordinate to the original dwelling and that of its adjoining neighbours. Furthermore, taking account of the form of the existing extension at No 159, the proposal would create a more equally balanced and unified development than currently exists when viewed alongside its adjoining neighbour. The proposed hipped roof profile would sit comfortably alongside the original and would further reduce the visual impact of the first-floor extension along with any potential risk of it creating a terracing effect within the streetscape.
9. The Council are concerned that the proposal would have a greater width than the guidance recommended in the Supplementary Planning Document 9: Householder Developments revised 2014 (SPD). Whilst this is the case, the SPD also recognises that consideration of this guidance must be given to site specific circumstances. Having regard to the above findings and additionally to the overall scale of the existing plot and the retention of the gap between the common boundary with No. 163, the proposed width along with the overall design, domestic scale and form of the proposed extension would not appear overly excessive or discordant against the original property or when viewed in the context of the pair of semi-detached properties or wider streetscape. The proposal would not, therefore, undermine the character of the street or the appeal property itself and high standards of urban design would be achieved, accordingly, the general design guidance and objectives of the SPD are met.
10. The Council note that whilst there are examples of similar proposals in the area which exceed the 3 metre wide guidance for side extensions, including

the one upon the adjoining property, these were granted planning approval prior to the adoption of the Local Development Framework, Development Management Policy DM1 (2011) (LDF) and SPD, and therefore do not set a precedent. I have no details of these other developments before me or their site-specific details. Nevertheless, I would agree that proposals are to be considered on their own individual merits and for the above mentioned reasons have found the proposal to comply with Policy DM1, The National Planning Policy Framework (The Framework) and guidance contained in the SPD.

11. Having regard to the above it is concluded that the proposal would not have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the appeal property and surrounding area. It therefore, accords with Policy DM1 of the LDF, the Framework, and guidance contained in the SPD for the above mentioned reasons.

Conditions

12. I have imposed the standard time limit condition and have specified the approved plans as this provides certainty. A condition is necessary for the materials to match those that are used in the existing property to maintain the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, it is recommended that the appeal should be allowed.

S Witherley

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

14. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal should be allowed.

Chris Preston

INSPECTOR