



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 July 2023

by K Lancaster BA (hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 01 September 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/A4520/D/23/3323250

39 Silverdale Way, South Shields NE34 9HB

- 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 Ms Laura Brain and Mr Jack Sexton against the decision of South Tyneside Council.
 - The application Ref ST/0074/23/HFUL, dated 3 February 2023, was refused by notice dated 24 May 2023.
 - The development proposed is single storey rear kitchen/dining room extension two storey front extension - hall/cupboard with conversion of existing garage to utility/W.C. to ground floor & first floor bedroom extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The Council's reason for refusal relates solely to the proposed two-storey extension to the front of the property. There is no dispute between the parties that the proposed single storey extension to the rear is acceptable and I have not been presented with any evidence which would lead me to reach an alternative conclusion. I have therefore considered the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal site, 39 Silverdale Way is a detached, two-storey dwelling, located in a small cul-de-sac which contains a mix of detached and semi-detached properties. Whilst there are some examples of two-storey extensions in the cul-de-sac, these are typically located to the side of the properties.
5. The proposed two-storey extension would be partly built above the existing garage but would project beyond the existing first-floor front elevation by approximately 2.5 metres, with a gabled design. The extension would be set down from the ridge by approximately 1 metre, with the eaves height matching those of the existing property. However, by virtue of its scale and massing the proposed extension would appear as a somewhat bulky addition to the host property.
6. The property is located at the entrance to a cul-de-sac, close to a main thoroughfare of the housing development, which means that the appeal site is highly visible from the surrounding area. The proposed extension, which would

be prominently sited on the front elevation, would by virtue of its scale and design, not appear subservient to the host property. As such, it would be viewed as a dominant and incongruous addition to the property.

7. Within the cul-de-sac there is a strong presence of forward projecting single storey elements at ground floor level, typically garages or bay windows. The proposed two-storey extension with its gabled design, would erode some of this character and therefore would not be in keeping with the character of surrounding properties. 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 existing property and the surrounding area. As such, the proposed extension would be highly conspicuous and represent an incongruous feature within the overall street scene.
8. My attention has been drawn to examples of similar extensions within the area, including at 22 Troutbeck Way and 16 Prensgarth Way. The appellant has put forward these examples to request that a fair and consistent approach to the consideration of their scheme is taken. However, the Council is in its assessment of these examples concluded that there are differences between these examples and the appeal proposal in terms of their location, scale of forward projection and surrounding context. I also note that these extensions were granted planning permission prior to the adoption of the Council's current development plan. This together with my own observations of these examples leads me to conclude that they are not directly comparable to the appeal proposal. In any event, this appeal has been considered on its own merits.
9. Consequently, I find that the proposed two-storey extension would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. This would be contrary to Policy DM1 of the South Tyneside Local Development Framework 2011, which, amongst other things, requires development, including extensions and alterations to existing buildings, to be designed to convey sensitive consideration of its surroundings, and where possible enhance its local setting and reinforce local identity, having particular regard to scale and proportions, alignment, form, use of materials and architectural detailing.
10. The proposed development would also conflict with the guidance contained within SPD9: Householder Developments which states that front extensions should not normally project forward of the original dwelling by more than 1.4 metres and that two-storey front extensions will only be permitted where the visual impact of the proposal on the dwelling and its immediate neighbourhood is acceptable and that high standards of urban design are achieved.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given, the development does not accord with the development plan when taken as a whole. There are no material considerations, including the Framework that indicate the appeal should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

K Lancaster

INSPECTOR