



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 May 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: 8TH June 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/X1355/D/20/3250717

21 Dilston Close, Peterlee, Co. Durham SR8 1NA

- 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 Corey Finnigan against the decision of Durham County Council.
 - The application Ref DM/19/03271/FPA, dated 11 October 2019, was refused by notice dated 22 January 2020.
 - The development proposed is retrospective application of proposed porch on front elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for construction of a porch on front elevation at 21 Dilston Close, Peterlee, Co. Durham SR8 1NA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref DM/19/03271/FPA, dated 11 October 2019.

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 Issue

3. The proposal has already been completed. The main issue is therefore the effect of the porch upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. No. 21 is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling located at Dilston Close, Peterlee. The property is constructed with what appears to be red brick and the roof of brown concrete tiles. The surrounding street scene is characterised by a mix of detached and semi-detached dwellings which are constructed of either red or brown brick, and roofs of either red or brown concrete tiles. Most of these materials have been weather-beaten and as such it is difficult to determine the original colours of roof tiles. A number of properties on the street have constructed front porches in a mix of sizes and material. Some are constructed in matching brick, some are finished in a cream coloured render, while some are part brick and white uPVC or white or brown timber frame. As

such, the porches within the street cannot be said to have an established distinctive character.

5. The Council have already established that the porch is not of a scale that overly dominates the host dwelling, and neither are the window design or anthracite steps visually harmful. I see no reason to take a different view. Given that there are other porches on the street constructed with a variety of materials which do not match the host dwellings including another example of cream coloured render finishing, the front porch at no.21 does not appear prominent on the street in such a manner that it is visually harmful. Furthermore, as observed on my site visit and contrary to the Council's argument, there are other examples of either host properties or front porches which have red concrete roof tiles. Specific examples are nos. 10 and 18. As a result, this has become somewhat characteristic of the area and there is no defined colour. As mentioned in paragraph 4 above, the roof tiles on the street are mostly weather-beaten and it is difficult to determine the original colours.
6. The porch on the front elevation at no. 21 is therefore not incongruous with the character of the surrounding street scene and having regard to the specific circumstances of the development and its relationship with neighbouring properties, I am satisfied that the cream coloured render and red roof tiles results in a well-balanced front porch that isn't at odds with the host property.
7. I find that the porch on front elevation at no.21 does not have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the host dwelling or the surrounding area and find no conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and saved policies 35 and 73 of the District of Easington Local Plan (2001) which seek amongst other things to ensure that new developments reflect the scale and character of adjacent buildings and the area generally, particularly in terms of site coverage, height, roof style, detailed design and materials.

Conditions

8. As the porch has already been completed and there is no dispute that it has been constructed according to plans submitted with the application for planning approval, no conditions are necessary to be attached to the appeal decision.

Conclusion and Recommendation

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

Ifeanyi Chukwujekwu

APPEALS PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

10. 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 allowed.

Chris Preston

INSPECTOR