



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 June 2021

by Alison Scott BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 July 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/J4525/W/21/3271729
25 Arthur Avenue, Sunderland SR2 0QF

- 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 Asa Donnell against the decision of Sunderland City Council.
 - The application Ref 21/00039/FUL, dated 9 January 2021, was refused by notice dated 8 March 2021.
 - The development proposed is Erection of 2 Storey Maisonette to side of existing dwelling.
-

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. Located in the Ryhope area of Sunderland, the appeal site is set amongst more traditional semi-detached dwellings to one side of Arthur Avenue, and modern houses opposite and adjacent.
4. Whilst the wider character of the area is mixed, the appeal property more closely identifies with the semi-detached dwellings of a traditional, uniform appearance, that are of a regular and ordered build pattern, form and grain.
5. A new maisonette dwelling of the proposed proportions, with a narrow frontage and irregular build alignment, would not relate to the distinctive character or appearance of these traditional houses. Further, the fenestration pattern would not follow that of the host dwelling and would appear at odds with the otherwise regular window arrangements of these houses. Overall, the recognisable symmetry of these houses would be lost as a consequence.
6. Additionally, the proposal may offer the opportunity to create designated off-street parking spaces at the site, a central footpath and planting. However, this proposed delineation would only seek to reinforce its discordant presence as a single dwelling, where more traditionally, low boundary walls enclosing front gardens are a characteristic feature of these house types, with gates for off-street parking. This pattern prevails within the local area.

7. Also, rear gardens to existing pairs of semi-detached houses are broadly equally proportioned. This proposal would effectively reduce the rear garden size by half and would not be in the spirit of the layout of this original planned development to which it relates.
8. It cannot be compared to a typical domestic extension of which there are limited numbers of a low-level nature, with a subservience to them. The proposal would consist of an entirely separate residential unit with its own main entrance proposed to the front elevation identifying it as such. Nor can it be compared to the scale and massing of the more modern houses or their design characteristics as it is not the same house type.
9. Whilst it may meet specific national size criteria for internal and external spaces, benefit from solar gain, and appeal to a range of potential occupiers, none of these factors outweigh the identified harm or lead me to reach an alternative conclusion on the matter.
10. Therefore, to conclude, the development would appear as a visually obtrusive dwelling that would cause material harm to the character and appearance of the local area. It would therefore fail to meet the objectives of the Sunderland City Council Core Strategy and Development Plan 2015-2033 policies BH1 and H7 in their combined aims for development to be in character and to achieve high quality design.

Conclusion

11. The proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area, in conflict with the development plan taken as a whole. There are no material considerations that indicate the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, for the reasons given, I conclude that the appeal should not succeed.

Alison Scott

INSPECTOR