



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 December 2021

by J Symmons BSc (Hons) CEng MICE

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 31st December 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/X1355/D/21/3284693

16 Stockley Court, Ushaw Moor DH7 7NS

- 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 Lee Thompson against the decision of Durham County Council.
 - The application Ref DM/21/01921/FPA, dated 26 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 13 August 2021.
 - The development proposed is a two storey extension to side of dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed two storey side extension on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is in a residential estate and consists of a two storey detached property on the corner plot between Broom Hall Drive and Stockley Court. It has a wide frontage, a single storey front extension and a large front parking area. The property's end gable extends beyond the frontage line of the adjacent bungalows on Broom Hall Drive and the property sits lower than this road.
4. The property is part of Stockley Court which is a cul-de-sac and the properties are all detached. Although there is a mix of wide and forward facing gable end frontages, the layout is quite regularised with many plots evenly spaced and frontages aligned. The properties are generally similar in size and construction.
5. The proposal would be an extension of the front single storey and the two storey end gable by around 3.4m. The extension would have the same roof and ridge heights and be finished in materials similar to the host property.
6. Policy 29 of the County Durham Plan 2020 (Local Plan) requires development to achieve well designed buildings and places having regard to supplementary planning documents and other local guidance where relevant. Amongst other matters, the policy ensures development contributes positively to the character and identity of the area.
7. The Council's adopted Residential Amenity Standards Supplementary Planning Document 2020 (SPD), provides guidance on the design of residential

dwelling, including side extensions. This recommends, amongst other matters, that side extensions should be designed to remain subordinate to the host property and, for corner plots, that it should not normally project beyond the return street frontage. The SPD is not just aimed at ensuring extensions are smaller than the host property but also that the design respects the character and appearance of both the property and the wider area.

8. The proposal would not affect neighbour separation or create any terracing effect. It would meet the SPD's recommended size of no more than 50% of the host property width however, it would not contain any other design features to make it subordinate such as a 1m front setback or lower roof ridge height. This would result in creating a flush and elongated frontage which would not be sympathetic to, and in keeping with, the host property, or the character and appearance of its surroundings. The front extension would not mitigate this elongation.
9. Furthermore, the proposal would position the gable much further towards Broom Hall Drive, projecting it significantly past the current return street frontage. This would make it much more visually prominent and imposing from the road. Even with the existing boundary fencing and lower property level, mitigation of this would not be achieved.
10. The appellant provided three examples of other properties in the vicinity which have been extended. Although these are similar to the appeal site, consisting of flush and elongated frontage extensions, they are not located in the same prominent and open position as No 16. The examples also do not have as much impact on the adjacent street frontage returns. As such the examples do not create the same visual harm to the character and appearance of the area as the appeal site.
11. In conclusion, the proposal fails to reflect and respond positively to the character and appearance of the area and does not accord with Policy 29 of the Local Plan and the SPD which, amongst other matters, ensures development contributes positively to the character and identity of the area.

Conclusion

12. There are no other considerations that indicate the application should be determined other than in accordance with the Local Plan. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

J Symmons

INSPECTOR