



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 June 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: 26 June 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/H4505/D/20/3248312

33 Sunderland Road Villas, Heworth, Gateshead NE10 8HB

- 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 Paul Cox against the decision of Gateshead Council.
 - The application Ref DC/19/00807/HHA, dated 4 August 2019, was refused by notice dated 8 January 2020.
 - The development proposed is two storey side extension, single storey rear extension, porch to front and extend garage in line.
-

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 Issue

3. The effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the host property and the street scene.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. No.33 is a semi-detached two-storey dwelling located on the southern side of Sunderland Road in Heworth, Gateshead. It is symmetrically paired with no.34. The surrounding area is residential, and the distinctive character on this side of the road is derived from predominantly hipped roof two-storey symmetrically paired semi-detached dwellings with side garages or driveways leading to garages at the rear. Whilst Sunderland Road is a lengthy street with some variety along its length there is particular uniformity in the stretch of dwellings which contains the appeal site. The matching pairs of dwellings from No. 27 up to No.34 all retain their original hipped roof and no two storey side extensions are evident such that the regular spacing between properties is maintained. These prominent features, along with the mature avenue of trees on the highway verge create the appearance of a neat and unified street scene.
5. There are a few examples in the wider area where properties have been extended at ground floor incorporating the garage and a front porch. There are also a few detached properties that lie to the east of the appeal property, as

well as a pair of symmetrically paired semi-detached properties which lie to the west which have gable roofs. Nonetheless, in the main, two-storey semi-detached pairs with hipped roofs are a distinguishing feature, particularly in the immediate vicinity. Notwithstanding some diversity therefore, the architectural integrity of the street scene remains largely intact and the uniformity in design is an attractive feature of the area.

6. The extension would involve the formation of a hip to gable roof enlargement extending to match the ridgeline of the existing roof which would substantially increase the mass and volume of the existing roof and would not appear subordinate to the existing property. The front wall of the extension would also be flush with the front wall of the host property and the extension would project to the side up to the common boundary with no. 32. The scale and design of the resulting roof and the scale of the two-storey side extension would be noticeably greater than that of the other paired dwellings on this side of Sunderland Road.
7. This would introduce an incongruous roof and building form into the otherwise symmetrical pair of properties and would significantly erode the gap between the dwelling and the neighbouring pair which result in an alien form of development in the context of the design of surrounding properties as described above. The contribution that the host property and adjoining dwelling make to the appearance of the street scene would be diminished as a result. The roof-form, scale and design of the development would appear out-of-keeping with the external appearance of the dwelling and the form of the extension would be visually harmful to the area's established symmetrical character.
8. My attention is drawn to an example in neighbouring Laburnum Avenue where a semi-detached property has been extended two storeys to the side and appears flush with the host property at ridge line and front wall. While I have not been presented with information regarding this development, it appears to be at a smaller scale than the appeal proposal and the roof form has not been altered. It still retains some form of symmetry with the adjoining property, both of which retain gable roofs. Nevertheless, being in a different street, this development has not influenced the individual context of the appeal proposal which I have considered on its own merits.
9. There is also an example at nos. 19 and 20 Sunderland Road where the roof at no.20 has been altered from hip to gable due to a rear roof extension. The Council state that this development was undertaken under permitted development and thus, it was not subject to the assessment of a formal planning application. This development does unbalance the symmetry of the pair of properties to a degree but the impact is limited compared to the scale and extent of the appeal proposal because the hip to gable roof conversion did not involve an associated two storey side extension as is the case in this instance.
10. In addition, numerous photographs have been provided of extensions to other properties within the local area. No information is provided relating to the background to those cases, including whether they have planning permission or when they were constructed. The design of some of the properties is clearly different to the hipped semi-detached property at the appeal site and not directly comparable: No. 1 Sunderland Road and 6 Field Lane are detached

dwellings with different design characteristics and a number of examples, including 26 and 35 Sunderland Road the original properties incorporated gable roofs and were of a different design to the appeal site.

11. There are examples of two storey side extensions being constructed flush with the front wall of the original dwelling, including Nos 40 and 57 Sunderland Road but those extensions incorporate hipped roofs to retain a degree of symmetry with the original pair and are not located within a long and relatively unaltered run of symmetrical pairs as is the case at the appeal site. Consequently, the other examples referred to do not amount to a justification for the harm that would arise from the proposal in this instance.
12. I find that the development would significantly harm the character and appearance of the host property and the street scene. Accordingly, it would conflict with the aims and objectives of paragraph 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the NPPF) with regard to design; and policies CS15 of the Core Strategy and Urban Core Plan for Gateshead and Newcastle upon Tyne 2010-2030 (2015) and ENV3 of the Unitary Development Plan which seek amongst other things to ensure that new development responds positively to local distinctiveness and character having regard to such factors as scale, massing, height, materials, density, legibility, views and vistas.

Conclusion and Recommendation

13. For all those reasons, having had regard to evidence before me, 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