



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 May 2020

by Alison Scott BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 May 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/J4525/D/20/3247131

1 Dunblane Road, Sunderland SR6 8EU

- 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 Martin Dilley against the decision of Sunderland City Council.
 - The application Ref 19/02103/SUB, dated 11 December 2019, was refused by notice dated 5 February 2020.
 - The development proposed is Two storey side and single storey front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of the development has been slightly varied by the Council and described as, *Erection of two storey side and single storey front/side extension*. This description accurately describes the proposal.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal site is located on a corner plot at the top of Dunblane Road and is semi-detached within a street scene of other uniform two-storey dwellings. The boundary treatment is chamfered to the front as it turns the corner with Danville Road
5. The appeal property is modest in scale but benefits from additional space given it is a corner site. This creates a sense of spaciousness to the plot and openness on the corner which is in evidence on many other corner turning plots, and is characteristic of the locality.
6. The proposal would infill the majority of this side space together with a forward front projection that would extend beyond the side wall of the proposed two storey element as it wraps around it.
7. Given the width of the two-storey side extension together with the proposed wrap around element to the ground floor, the development would appear excessively wide in this location. At the width proposed, the extension would be in conflict with the advice contained within the Council's Household Alterations

and Extensions Local Development Framework Supplementary Planning Document 2010 (SPD) for side extensions to exceed no more than 50% of the overall width of the original dwelling. This ensures the extension would appear subordinate to the host dwelling.

8. Therefore, given the excessively wide extension, with limited space remaining to the side beyond the proposed extension, it would appear cramped within its restricted space. Given the prominent corner position, the open character here would be significantly reduced, thus the development would not respect and enhance the appearance of the street scene, but would appear harmful to its character and appearance.
9. Direct comparisons with the appeal site and other extended dwellings along Dunblane Road have been made by the appellant. However, these other dwellings are not located on corner plots, and furthermore, the front extensions do not wrap around the two-storey element due to the constraints of their site. At 2 Derry Avenue, whilst this is also a corner plot, the plot was originally larger than the appeal site, and there is a wider gap remaining between the side wall of the two-storey extension and the perimeter of the site, therefore a sense of spaciousness is retained and this characteristic of the street scene remains. It is also apparent that this dwelling has no front extension, and therefore is not directly comparable to the appeal site.
10. I conclude that due to the overall scale and massing of the proposal on this prominent corner, would appear visually dominant within the street scene, harmful to the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore be contrary to the design aims of Policy BH1 of the Sunderland City Council Core Strategy and Development Plan 2015-2033, dated January 2020, as well as the SPD that seeks to encourage high standards of design quality in the built environment. Finally, the proposal would conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework with particular regard to its objection to achieve well-designed places.
11. For the reasons given, the appeal is dismissed.

Alison Scott

INSPECTOR