



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 February 2021

by Alison Scott BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 February 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/A4520/D/20/3263102

4 Bywell Road, Cleadon, Sunderland SR6 7QT

- 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 Ms Andrea George against the decision of South Tyneside Council.
 - The application Ref ST/0333/20/HFUL, dated 30 April 2020, was refused by notice dated 21 August 2020.
 - The development proposed is Two storey rear extension, attic conversion with rear attic stair extension, single storey side extension and associated works.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a fine example of a traditional semi-detached Edwardian dwelling. Whilst alterations to both dwellings are visible, there is strong symmetry with its attached neighbour of No 2.
4. The proposal entails a number of extensions to the dwelling. With regards to the proposed single storey side extension and the rear two-storey extension to the off-shot return, both of these would be of a scale that would be compatible with the host dwelling. Given this, together with their design, would appear as subservient extensions to the dwelling and would not result in harm arising to the character and appearance of the area.
5. Further development is proposed to infill the space between the existing return and the attached neighbour by creating a two-storey extension and also extending the attic space.
6. The attic room would be opened up by removing the slope of the back of the existing pitched roof. A double gable with interconnecting flat roof would be designed by extending the attic floorplate over part of the proposed extended first-floor space below. As it would extend from just below the host ridge line, and considerably forward of the existing sloping roof, it would add significant

mass to the roof slope appearing bulky and top heavy, compounded by the uncharacteristic roof design.

7. This uncharacteristic form of development would be further reinforced by the rear wall that is proposed to be built up with a flat roof element and eaves level broadly in line with the eaves level of the original return.
8. Due to its proposed scale, it would be seen most visibly from Whitburn Road and the access into Bywell Road as it would not be sufficiently screened by the attached dwelling. Furthermore, it would be seen from several other public vantages including from behind the appeal site, as well as private views.
9. Overall, as the combinations of extensions would significantly distort and dominate the original proportions of the appeal property, it would result in a prominent and inharmonious form of development that would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the host dwelling, and the area.
10. I have been made aware of other extensions to nearby dwellings. However, as is my duty, I have made my assessment based on the proposal before me and reached my own conclusion on the matter.
11. Therefore to conclude, taken as a whole, the proposal would lead to an incongruous form of development that would be harmful to the character and appearance of the dwelling and to the area. It would conflict with the South Tyneside Local Development Framework Development Management Policies 2011, Policy DM1 in its design objectives.

Other Matters

12. The appellant raises internal head heights within the dwelling and access restrictions to the attic space to support their scheme, however, that is not to say that they could not explore alternative forms of development to this proposal.
13. Any concerns regarding the Council's service should be in the first instance directed to them and is not within my scope to comment.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons I have given, the appeal is dismissed.

Alison Scott

INSPECTOR