



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 April 2024

by P Storey BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7 May 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/J4525/D/24/3336461

28 Farndale Avenue, Sunderland SR6 8BH

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Ian Wilkinson against the decision of Sunderland City Council.
 - The application Ref is 23/02177/FUL.
 - The development proposed is two storey side, single storey front and rear extensions.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a semi-detached house in a residential area. Although there are a variety of dwelling types in the area, the majority are semi-detached houses of similar appearance to the appeal property.
4. The proposal seeks to construct various extensions to the property. The Council's concerns appear limited to the 2-storey side extension, and I have determined the appeal on this basis.
5. Section 2 of the Development Management Supplementary Planning Document – June 2021 (the SPD) provides planning and design guidance to those wishing to extend or alter a dwellinghouse. Insofar as the SPD provides detailed guidance on this topic to supplement the policies of the development plan, it is a material consideration to which I attach significant weight.
6. The SPD advises that side extensions must have an acceptable relationship with the host property and wider streetscene and should appear as a subordinate addition to the dwelling. It goes on to advise that proposals for 2-storey and first floor side extensions should, inter alia, be a width which is no more than 50% the width of the original dwellinghouse and include a ridge line to the extension's roof that is set lower than the ridge line of the existing dwelling's roof.
7. In this case, the 2-storey side extension would sit flush with the existing front and rear elevations of the dwelling, effectively extending its full profile further sideways. It would also exceed the figure of 50% of the width of the original dwelling, as advised by the SPD.

8. The adjoining semi-detached dwelling has already been extended to the side. Although the Council notes it does not fully comply with the provisions of the SPD, the property has been extended in such a way that it appears subordinate and retains the proportions of the original dwelling. Conversely, by virtue of its width, height and massing, the proposed development would fail to appear as a subordinate addition and would appear incongruous and dominant, creating a visual imbalance when viewed together with its adjoining neighbour.
9. Moreover, the appeal property is located close to a prominent junction and the proposed extension would be widely visible not only from its immediate vicinity, but from passing vehicles and pedestrians, as well as from dwellings in the adjoining street. Although the SPD advises that all cases will be considered on their own merits and greater flexibility may be possible, I find no specific reasons to take a particularly flexible view in this case.
10. I note the appellant's statement that the extension would be set away from the side boundary, and the presence of a public footpath to the side of the property would remove the concern of a terracing effect. Although I do not dispute this, it would not overcome the issues previously discussed.
11. I viewed the nearby examples cited by the appellant during my visit and I noted some similarities with the appeal proposal. However, notwithstanding that I must consider the appeal on its own merits, I found the context of the nearby examples to be very different to that of the appeal proposal. Both examples were largely embedded within streets, whereas the appeal site occupies a more prominent and visible position, as previously described. These examples therefore offer limited weight in my decision.
12. For the reasons given above, by virtue of the design, scale, massing and position of the proposed 2-storey side extension, the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the area and conflict with Policy BH1 of the Core Strategy and Development Plan 2015-2033 – January 2020, which seeks, in respect of this issue, for development to be of a scale, massing, layout, appearance and setting which respects and enhances the positive qualities of nearby properties and the locality. It would also conflict with the provisions of the SPD, the aims of which have previously been set out.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

P Storey

INSPECTOR