



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 January 2021

by David Cross BA(Hons) PgDip(Dist) TechIOA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 January 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/X1355/D/20/3258142

10 Brydon Crescent, South Hetton DH6 2SP

- 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 Dominic Snowdon against the decision of Durham County Council.
 - The application Ref DM/20/00485/FPA, dated 19 February 2020, was refused by notice dated 20 July 2020.
 - The development proposed is the erection of two storey extension and the installation of 2 no. roof lights to north elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of the development provided on the planning application form has been replaced by a more concise version on the decision notice, and this is reflected in subsequent appeal documents. I consider that subsequent description to accurately reflect the proposal and I have therefore used it within this decision.
3. This appeal must be determined on the basis of the development plan as it exists at the time of my decision. Subsequent to the Council's decision, it has adopted the County Durham Plan 2020 (CDP). The Council has confirmed that this supersedes the policies referred to in its decision notice and has also confirmed the policies of the CDP which are relevant to this appeal. The appellant has had the opportunity to comment on the new development plan. I have therefore considered the appeal against the relevant adopted policies and make no further reference to superseded policies.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on the:
 - Living conditions of residents of 9 Brydon Crescent with regards to outlook and light; and
 - Character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

Living Conditions

5. The proposal would consist of a one storey extension above an existing single storey ground floor extension located to the rear of the dwelling. This would project along the full length of the boundary with 9 Brydon Crescent.
6. Due to the height and length of the proposal, I saw that it would have an overdominant and unacceptably enclosing impact on the rear windows and amenity area of No 9. Due to its scale and proximity to the boundary, the proposal would also lead to an unacceptable loss of daylight and sunlight to the rear yard and windows of No 9, particularly in the mornings due to the arrangement of the properties.
7. I note that a resident of No 9 has written in support of the proposal and that he considers that it would not be overbearing in respect of his property or surrounding properties. However, based on my own observations, this does not lead me to a different conclusion in respect of the harm to existing and future residents of No 9.
8. I conclude that the proposal would lead to significant harm to the living conditions of residents of No 9 in respect of outlook and light. The proposal would therefore be contrary to the amenity requirements of policies 29 and 31 of the CDP. The proposal would also be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) in respect of providing a high standard of amenity for existing and future users of properties.

Character and Appearance

9. The appeal site is part of a terrace which has a variety of extensions and outbuildings located at ground floor level to the rear. Extended views along the rear terrace are enabled from the surrounding area due to the street layout.
10. At first floor level, the rear of the terrace is largely unaltered. Within that context, the first floor extension projecting along the full length of the rear area to the site boundary would appear as an obtrusive and bulky addition to the rear of the terrace. The unacceptable visual impact would be exacerbated due to its prominence in the extended views along the rear of the terrace.
11. I conclude that due to its scale, design and location, the proposed extension would lead to significant harm to the character and appearance of the area. The proposal would therefore be contrary to policy 29 of the CDP which requires development to contribute positively to an area's character. The proposal would also be contrary to the Framework in respect of achieving well-designed places.

Other Matters

12. I am mindful of the appellant's intention to improve the quality of accommodation for his family, as well as the established nature of the family in this area and the contribution they make to the community. However, the benefits in respect of this are not of such weight to outweigh the significant harm I have identified previously.
13. The appellant also refers to extensions in the vicinity which he considers set a precedent for the appeal proposal. However, I have not been provided with

sufficient details of these other schemes to determine if they represent a direct parallel to the appeal proposal, including matters such as the scale of development, relationship with neighbouring properties and the planning controls in place at the time the extensions were built. In any event, I have determined this appeal on its own merits.

14. In support of the proposal, the appellant refers to the economic benefits arising from employment and investment in the delivery of the project. However, due to the scale of the development, such benefits would be very limited and for a limited period of time.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

David Cross

INSPECTOR