



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 February 2022

by C. Megginson

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17th February 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/J4525/D/21/3286737

23 Houltsyke Close, Sunderland, SR3 2YE

- 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 Mrs Pauline Slee against the decision of Sunderland City Council.
 - The application Ref 21/02022/FUL, dated 24 August 2021, was refused by notice dated 19 October 2021.
 - The development proposed is a single storey front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The effect on the character and appearance of the host property and the street scene.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a single storey semi-detached dwelling in a cul-de-sac, and is the first in a row of semi-detached bungalows which continues to the south. These properties have a straightforward and pleasing design with a consistent front building line and simple regular roofline as you view the row as a whole.
4. The appeal property forms a semi-detached block with No 22. The adjacent bungalow to the north, No 24, is a detached bungalow which stands forward of the front elevation of the appeal property. The wider cul-de-sac features predominantly two storey semi-detached and link properties. Driveways and lawned front gardens give the street an open feel.
5. The appeal proposal would have a forward projection of around 2.3 metres, including the installation of a bow window, and would be set around 0.3 metres away from the boundary with No 22 and have a pitched roof design. The scale and design of the proposed front extension is such that it would give rise to a prominent feature that would be significantly at odds with the current appearance of both the appeal property and the adjacent property of No 22. This would disrupt the roofline of the semi-detached block, fundamentally altering its shape and unbalancing its form. This would be contrary to guidance within the Sunderland City Council Development Management Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) (2021) which states that front extensions should project no more than 1.2 metres from the property's front elevation, particularly where there is a consistent front building line shared with neighbouring properties. As a result, the proposed front extension would harm

the contribution of the bungalow, and the semi-detached block of which it forms a part, to the streetscene.

6. My attention has been drawn to other front extensions in the area, in particular the single storey bungalows on the entrance to the estate. I note that the appellant states that they aimed to produce a scheme similar to others in the estate. Whilst I appreciate that several of the properties within the estate have been extended, the circumstances in each proposal are likely to be different, and from my site visit I could not see any properties similar in design to the semi-detached bungalows on Houlsyke Close that had been extended. The bungalows at the entrance to the estate are detached and have a different design and roofline to the appeal property.
7. Whilst the estate comprises several different house designs, this does not detract from the positive contribution that the simple, cohesive design of the row of semi-detached bungalows makes to the character and appearance of the streetscene. The appellant also notes the large size of the front gardens to the properties. Whilst this may be the case, the proposal would still appear prominent within the context of the front garden.
8. I therefore conclude that the proposed single storey front extension would unacceptably harm the character of the host property and the streetscene. This would be contrary to policy BH1 of the Sunderland City Council Core Strategy and Development Plan (2020) and the SPD. These policies seek to ensure that new development delivers high quality design and positive improvement which complements the host property and the wider street scene. The proposal would also be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework, which states in paragraph 130 that planning decisions should ensure that developments will add to the overall quality of the area and are sympathetic to local character.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above, having considered the development plan as a whole and all other relevant matters, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

C. Megginson

INSPECTOR