



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 October 2024 by J Reed MPlan

Decision by Mr A Spencer-Peet BSc(Hons) PGDip.LP Solicitor (Non Practising)

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7th January 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/A4520/D/24/3349210

2 Hylton Avenue, South Shields, NE34 7SD

- 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 Michael Wilson against the decision of South Tyneside Council.
 - The application Ref is ST/0355/24/HFUL.
 - The development proposed is to demolish existing single storey side offshot (utility room and shower room). Construct new 2 storey side extension - dining room, W.C, utility room, play room, store and en-suite bedroom and dressing room.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site is situated at the end of the cul-de-sac of Hylton Avenue which consists of two storey semi detached dwellings with gable roofs and finished in brick. They are generally consistent in their form and design with some properties possessing single storey extensions to the side or front. Their siting, style, form and finish gives the area a local distinctiveness which creates a sense of uniformity and cohesion.
5. The proposed two storey side extension would be set back at the front elevation and set down from the ridge height of the host building. However, the extension would significantly enlarge the footprint of the existing dwelling and thus would not appear to be visually subordinate to the host building when viewed from within the surrounding area. The resultant development would fail to harmonise with the original architectural composition of the host dwelling and diminish the setting of the existing property. As a result, the proposal would unacceptably erode the uniformed quality of the area.

6. The South Tyneside Local Development Framework (2011) Policy DM1 seeks to ensure that all development, including new buildings, extensions and alterations to existing buildings, is 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. The original dwelling's modest form, which is consistent with other dwellings within Hylton Avenue, would be much diminished by the proposal. In the street scene, the resultant building would thus be markedly at odds with the prevailing style of houses in the road with the small single storey side element a key design feature of the properties.
7. The Council's Householder Developments within South Tyneside Council (2014) supplementary planning document (SPD9) provides guidance on two storey extensions in regard to design and form. The proposal would conflict with the advice set out in Part 7 in SPD9, which outlines that consideration must be given to the width of two storey side extensions, with proposals over 3 metres in width, or those that would be more than half the width of the existing dwelling, not supported. In this case the proposal would significantly enlarge the dwelling's footprint and be over 3 metres in width. This would result in a visually oppressive incongruous addition which lacks cohesion within the generally architecturally uniform street.
8. Although the proposed extension would use appropriate materials and the fenestration would match that of the existing dwelling, it would not respond positively to the original form of the host building and would unacceptably erode the uniform quality of the area by reason of its size and bulk.
9. For the reasons set out, the side extension would have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and area. As such it fails to comply with the relevant provisions of Policy DM1 (A) of the South Tyneside Local Development Framework (2011) and the relevant sections of the National Planning Policy Framework which both require development to be compatible with the host property and the surrounding area. The proposal would also be contrary to the guidance set out in Part 7 of the Householder Developments within South Tyneside Council (2014) supplementary planning document, which requires all extensions to respect the scale, form, proportions, character and appearance of the main dwelling and the locality.

Other Matters

10. I have also noted the appellant's submission in relation to the creation of more usable living space for their family. Whilst I do not doubt that this would be the case, this private benefit would not outweigh the harm that I have identified in relation to the main issue. I also acknowledge the possibility of the creation of employment opportunities during the proposed works. However, I consider this to only be a very limited and temporary benefit which, in combination with any other benefits, would not outweigh the harm identified.

Conclusion and Recommendation

11. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

J Reed APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

12. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Mr A Spencer-Peet

INSPECTOR