



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 February 2020 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: 27th March 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/P2935/D/19/3241400

Lorrain, 11 Lynemouth Road, Ellington NE61 5HN

- 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 Phillip Traise¹ against the decision of Northumberland County Council.
 - The application Ref 19/03756/FUL, dated 4 September 2019, was refused by notice dated 6 November 2019.
 - The development proposed is rear ground floor extension.
-

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.

Main Issues

3. Work on the development has already begun and construction work was continuing at the time of my site visit. The external walls had largely been completed and work on the construction of the roof appeared to be ongoing. I have based my assessment on what I witnessed on site and on the proposed plans which depict the proposal as it would appear when completed. The main issues are the effect of the development upon 1) the character and appearance of the host dwelling and area and 2) the living conditions of occupants of Holmside, no. 12 Lynemouth Road, having particular regard to light and outlook.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Character and appearance

4. No.11 is a modest semi-detached bungalow located on Lynemouth Road. It symmetrically adjoins no.12. The surrounding area is residential, and this particular stretch of Lynemouth Road is characterised by symmetrically paired semi-detached properties which are predominantly bungalows, although there are a few two-storey pairs. The properties, which have attractive hipped roofs and projecting front bays, are set back from the road behind well maintained

¹ Taken from application form for clarity, although there appears to be an error in spelling.

front gardens. Pairs of properties are separated by drives leading up to garages at the rear, which also provide long views from the streets to the back gardens. The attractive and well-maintained nature of the properties create the appearance of a neat and unified street scene.

5. The rear ground floor extension protrudes to a depth of approximately 10 metres which roughly doubles the depth of the original property. When compared to the modest scale of the host property the extension does not represent a subordinate addition but appears as a bulky and dominant addition which is visually harmful to the character and appearance of the host property.
6. In addition to the scale of the extension, the side walls extend above the eaves level of the hipped roof which creates an unsympathetic juncture where the flat roof intersects with the attractive hipped roof of the host dwelling. The roof of the property is an important element in its attractive character and the shared symmetry with the neighbouring property. The introduction of this incongruous feature into the otherwise symmetrical pair of properties results in an unsympathetic form of development. The contribution that the host property and adjoining dwelling make to the appearance of the area is diminished as a result.
7. As has been established in paragraph 4 above, the drive to the side of the property offers views to the rear and as observed during the site visit, the extension can be seen from Lynemouth Road when approaching from the east. In any event, policy H14 of the Castle Morpeth District Local Plan 1991 – 2006 (2003) (the 'LP') requires that extensions respect the appearance of the host property, regardless of whether they are seen from the street. Similarly, the requirement for good design as set out in chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) applies to all development.
8. I recognise that the property occupies a large plot but the scale of the original dwelling and its neighbours is modest. It does not follow that a large extension to the dwelling should be permitted because the garden is substantial. Notwithstanding the size of the curtilage the extension would amount to a disproportionate and unsympathetic addition to the original dwelling.
9. The appellant refers to a fallback position having regard to permitted development (PD) rights. However, there is no automatic right to extend more than 3m from the original rear wall of the property and any extension with a depth of between 3m and 6m from the original rear wall would need to gain prior approval before work could commence. It is not possible to gain prior approval for work that has already commenced and the current structure would need to be removed before such an application could be considered. I cannot prejudge the outcome if an application for prior approval was made and, even if prior approval for a 6m rear extension was granted the depth would be substantially less than that of the current proposal. Consequently, the suggested fall-back scenario attracts limited weight.
10. Taking the above arguments altogether I find that by virtue of its excessive depth and design, the proposal is a disproportionate and incongruous addition to the property and is harmful to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. Consequently, it conflicts with the aims and objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and Policy H14 of Castle Morpeth District Local Plan 1991 – 2006 (2003) (the 'LP') which seek amongst other things to ensure that proposals to alter, improve or

extend dwellings do not have an adverse impact on the appearance of the property and the street scene.

Living conditions at no.12

11. As previously stated, the extension protrudes well beyond the established building line with no.12. The flank wall is directly on the boundary of the two properties and is of substantial height, being considerably above the height of the existing single storey extensions. By virtue of its depth, scale and position the proposed extension would have an overbearing impact when viewed from rear lounge windows of no.12 and when viewed from the garden immediately to the rear of the dwelling. Given orientation and the juxtaposition of the two properties, the proposed extension would have a negative effect upon outlook because of its depth, massing and proximity. Given its position, directly to the south and east of no.12 the substantial flank wall would result in overshadowing in the morning hours and reduce the amount of daylight reaching the habitable space.
12. When all of those factors are taken together, I find that the development has a materially harmful effect upon the living conditions of the occupiers of no.12. Accordingly, it conflicts with the objectives of the Framework and Policy H14 of the LP which seek amongst other things to ensure that proposals to alter, improve or extend dwellings do not have an adverse impact on the amenity of nearby residents.

Conclusion and Recommendation

13. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

Ifeanyi Chukwujekwu

APPEALS PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

14. 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