



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 January 2022

by C Dillon BA (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1 February 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/A4520/D/21/3288102

59 Iona Road, Jarrow NE32 4HY

- 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 & Mrs Topcliff against the decision of South Tyneside Council.
 - The application Ref ST/0691/21/HFUL, dated 30 June 2021, was refused by notice dated 24 September 2021.
 - The development proposed is a proposed two storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for a two storey side extension at 59 Iona Road, Jarrow NE32 4HY in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref ST/0691/21/HFUL, dated 30 June 2021, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 1. The development hereby permitted shall begin no later than three years from the date of this decision.
 2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:
Existing Floor Plans and Elevations Ref 01 Rev, dated 22 December 2020
Existing Site Plan, undated
Location Plan, dated 5 January 2021
Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations ref 02 Rev. B, dated 11 June 2021
Proposed Site Plan, undated.
 3. The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the appeal proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling, the adjoining dwelling and the wider street scene, with particular regard to scale and design.

Reasons

3. This well-established residential area is characterised by semi-detached properties with front and rear gardens, laid out in a suburban estate street pattern. Corner plots tend to have more generous side gardens or are bound by grassed public spaces and highway verges. These characteristics contribute to a sense of space within the street scene. Hipped roofs, brick elevations and horizontally proportioned window openings are all distinct design features of

the appeal dwelling and many of the surrounding properties. This corner plot is situated between Iona Road and Lanark Drive and enjoys a more generous plot width and spacing with its neighbours. This dwelling's elevations are very visible from public vantage points along both streets. Notwithstanding this, the property's side and rear garden enjoy a high level of seclusion given the height and design of the existing boundary wall, fence and gates.

4. The Council's Supplementary Planning Document SPD9: Householder Developments ("the SPD9") advises on how side extensions should be designed to be subordinate to the original dwelling and avoid a terracing effect. The appeal proposal would have a stepped ridge and recessed first floor front elevation. However, these 2 particular measures would fall short of the dimensions encouraged in SPD9. In addition, the width of the appeal proposal would be in excess of that set out in this guidance.
5. Although the appeal proposal would be visible when travelling in either direction along Iona Road and Lanark Drive, it would not straddle beyond the prevailing building line of either street. The part of garden that would be built upon does not significantly contribute to the sense of openness in the current street scene at ground floor level given the height and solid nature of the existing boundary treatment. Furthermore, a reasonable level of private outdoor space would be retained, including an area of garden located between the side elevation of the appeal proposal and boundary with Lanark Drive. The appeal proposal would achieve a much greater separation distance with the public footpath than required by that guidance. In addition, the remaining space between the appeal proposal and Nos 61 and 63 Iona Road, and also the recreational space opposite would provide an appropriate visual separation between buildings.
6. As such, the appeal proposal would not have a cramped disposition within the plot. Neither would the sense of space and openness of this part of the street scene be eroded to an extent that would adversely alter that positive characteristic of the area.
7. The appeal proposal would incorporate many of the design characteristics of both the host property and its neighbours, including its hipped roof design, materials of construction, as well as the proportions and solid to void ratio of window openings. Moreover, the proposed design and positioning of the appeal proposal relative to the plot would adequately break up the scale and massing of the appeal proposal.
8. Consequently, in combination the proposed design measures would enable the proposal to be distinguished from the host dwelling, thereby conveying an adequate degree of subservience. Furthermore, the proposed design and materials accord with the appearance of the host dwelling and its neighbours, thus lessening the visual presence of the proposal within the street scene.
9. By its very nature, the proposed sideways extension would change the balance and symmetry of this pair of semi-detached properties. However, an appropriate degree of symmetry and rhythm with the host property, the adjoining dwelling and the wider street scene would still be attained.
10. Consequently, the appeal proposal would not represent an excessively large, disproportionately scaled or unduly dominant feature within this particular street scene. Neither would it disturb the pattern of built development here to

an extent that would be visually intrusive. Overall, this particular combination of circumstances will adequately distract attention from the appeal proposal's more generous width.

11. For the reasons given, this particular proposal would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling, the adjoining dwelling and the wider street scene, with particular regard to scale and design.
12. In the absence of harm, I find no conflict with the objectives of SPD9. That guidance acknowledges that there will inevitably be instances where it is justified for decisions to deviate from it. Policy DM1(A) of the South Tyneside Local Development Framework ("the LDF") seeks amongst other things to ensure that extensions are designed to convey sensitive consideration of their surroundings and reinforce local identity including having particular regard to scale and proportions, form and use of materials. In the absence of any harm, there is no conflict with that policy, or with the development plan when taken as a whole.

Conditions

13. In addition to the standard time limit, a condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans specified is necessary as it provides certainty. I have imposed a condition specifying materials as this is necessary to safeguard the character and appearance of the host site and its surrounding area.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given, the appeal should be allowed subject to the conditions specified.

C Dillon

INSPECTOR