



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 February 2021

by Alison Scott BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 February 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/J4525/D/20/3262959

37 Hill Rise, Washington Village, Washington NE38 7HL

- 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 James Tansey against the decision of Sunderland City Council.
 - The application Ref 20/01577/FUL, dated 28 August 2020, was refused by notice dated 23 October 2020.
 - The development proposed is Front single storey extension and Garage conversion with internal alterations and proposed side elevation windows to form open plan Kitchen/Dining and additional Bedrooms. New entrance proposed.
-

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 property is located within a row of other similar bungalows within the Hill Rise housing estate. The street scene consists of modern two storey houses and bungalows with a unifying characteristic of the projecting garages to the front elevations. The appeal site and its adjacent bungalows have detached garages set forward of the front elevation.
4. The proposal would entail converting and extending the existing detached garage into habitable space and to extend the front of the bungalow by an infill extension to tie into the converted space.
5. This proposal would add considerable mass and bulk to the dwelling. It would be further pronounced as it would encompass a significant amount of external space to the front elevation with a staggered building line arrangement.
6. The combination of extensions would create a long and wide projection that would add disproportionate and uncharacteristic extensions to the dwelling. It would not appear as a subordinate extension but rather appear as discordant in this location, resulting in detrimental harm arising to the character and appearance of the appeal property and to the street scene.
7. Other bungalows may have created an infill between the main dwelling and the garage, however these do not precisely follow the same amount of

development or exactly the same staggered building line arrangement as the proposal before me. In addition, their precise planning details are not before me to comment upon. A new build development cannot be compared to this scheme.

8. The proposal would not result in a harmonious addition to the appeal property or the street scene and would therefore not meet the objectives of the Sunderland City Council Core Strategy and Development Plan 2015-2033 (January 2020) Policy BH1, the Interim Development Management Planning Guidance 2020 or the National Planning Policy Framework in their combined aims to achieve well designed places.

Other Matters

9. The appeal property may be too small for the appellant's needs and an extension may generate some revenue from construction, however these factors do not lead me to reach a different conclusion.

Conclusion

10. Having considered all matters before me, the appeal is dismissed.

Alison Scott

INSPECTOR