



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 May 2023

by D Hartley BA(Hons) MTP MBA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9th May 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/J4525/D/23/3318766 32 Barnes View, Sunderland SR4 7QA

- 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 Richard Marshall against the decision of Sunderland City Council.
 - The application Ref 22/01626/FUL, dated 19 July 2022, was refused by notice dated 31 January 2023.
 - The development proposed is a new single storey extension with patio area and alterations to existing bay window.
-

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 a two-storey semi-detached dwelling positioned within a long and landscaped front garden facing Barnes Park. I acknowledge that No. 26 Barnes View has been altered in recent years and includes an imposing two storey flat roof front extension, rendered walls, a relatively large front roof dormer and no curved bay windows. However, this arrangement is the exception rather than the norm in this part of Barnes View and, overall, and to the passer-by the period properties are appreciated as having a pleasing consistency to their appearance including the provision of distinctive two storey curved bays, the use of brick walls, hipped roofs and a linear pattern of dwellinghouses set well back from the main road and with intervening landscaped front gardens.
4. The proposal would include a single storey flat roof extension which would be similar in height and width to the conservatory that it would replace, albeit that it would not project as far towards the main road as the conservatory. I do not agree with the Council that such development would be dominant or unsympathetic in design terms given the height, size and appearance of the conservatory that it would replace. There would be some conflict with the Council's Development Management SPD 2021 given the projection of the single storey extension, but in the context of the position and projection of the existing conservatory this conflict would not be sufficient to justify withholding planning permission.

5. My principal concern relates to the loss of the curved bay window and its replacement with a much more angular form of development. This would cause harm to the balance and symmetry of the pair of semi-detached dwellings and to the overall character and appearance of this part of Barnes View.
6. I note the appellants comment that the appeal properties in this street are partly screened from view owing to the various means of enclosure and landscaping. Nevertheless, the characterful curved bay windows are noticeable from the main road and from the footpath opposite within Barnes Park. I acknowledge that the appellant has found it difficult to find blinds or curtains to fit the curved bay windows. While I do not doubt that this is the case, there is nonetheless no evidence before me to indicate that bespoke options would not be possible. This is not therefore a matter that provides sufficient justification for allowing poor design.
7. The above harm would be compounded as it is proposed to render part of the existing front brick wall of the house. This would result in the proposal departing even further from the design synergy that exists between the semi-detached properties in this part of the street.
8. The appellant has drawn my attention to a flat roof front extension that has been built at No. 27 Barnes View. My concern in respect of this appeal does not relate to the proposed flat roof front extension, but rather to the loss of the curved bay windows. Furthermore, and, in any event, No. 27 Barnes View is a detached dwellinghouse rather than a semi-detached dwellinghouse.
9. For the reasons outlined above, I find that when the proposal is considered as whole it constitutes poor design and would cause material harm to the character and appearance of the area. Therefore, I conclude that it would not accord with the design, character and appearance requirements of policy BH1 of the adopted 2020 Core Strategy and Development Plan 2015-2033 and chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2021.

Conclusion

10. I conclude that the proposal would not accord with the development plan for the area taken as a whole and there are no material considerations that indicate the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, the appeal should be dismissed.

D Hartley

INSPECTOR