



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 July 2025

by F Harrison BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24th July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/J4525/D/25/3363712

15 Burcombe Close, Sunderland SR2 0FJ

- 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 Jonny Lewis against the decision of Sunderland City Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00038/FHH.
 - The development proposed is a two-storey gable end extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for a two-storey gable end extension at 15 Burcombe Close, Sunderland, SR2 0FJ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 25/00038/FHH, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Existing/Proposed Elevations; Proposed Front Elevation; Proposed Rear Elevation; Proposed Side Elevation; Proposed Site Plan and Proposed Plans.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building, and the window on the side elevation shall be fitted with obscured glazing and shall be retained as such thereafter.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development above is taken from the application form, removing wording that is not an act of development.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupiers of 11 and 12 Burcombe Close, with regard to outlook and daylight/sunlight.

Reasons

4. Nos 11 and 12 face the largely blank brick wall of the appeal property but have a generally open outlook towards their own and neighbouring rear gardens. The proposal would result in development being in closer proximity to these properties and would not achieve the advised separation distance set out in the Development Management Supplementary Planning Document (2021) (SPD). In these situations,

the SPD says that consideration should be given to the circumstances of the site and the specific relationship between the property and the affected neighbours.

5. While the proposal would not be set away from the boundary fence, there is a car parking space and footpath to the rear of No 12 and a footpath to the rear of No 11 which would provide some separation from their properties and gardens to the appeal scheme. I also note that the appeal property without the proposed extension is already closer to No 12 than the SPD advises. Taking account of the proposal's relationship to its context and the existing open outlook experienced by the occupiers of Nos 11 and 12, the proposal would not be dominant in views or have an overbearing effect to the extent that it would significantly affect the occupiers living conditions from both within their properties and their rear gardens. It therefore follows that a good standard of amenity would be maintained.
6. The rear of Nos 11 and 12 are south-west facing and so generally receive a good amount of daylight/sunlight. The appellant's sun path and overshadowing analysis shows that at certain times of the day and year there would be some minor increases in overshadowing. However, any effects would be restricted to the garden areas of Nos 11 and 12 and the reduction in the amount of daylight/sunlight would not be so significant that it would diminish the occupiers' reasonable enjoyment of their gardens.
7. To conclude, the proposal would not have an unacceptable effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of Nos 11 and 12, with regard to outlook and daylight/sunlight. It would accord with Policy BH1 of the Core Strategy and Development Plan 2015-2033 (2020) insofar as this policy requires development to maintain a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupiers of land and buildings.

Conditions

8. A plans condition is necessary and reasonable in the interests of certainty. I have also imposed a materials condition in the interests of the character and appearance of the area. This includes a requirement for the window on the side elevation to be obscure glazed to protect the privacy of neighbouring occupiers.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above the proposal accords with the development plan, read as a whole. There are no material considerations that indicate a decision should be made other than in accordance with it. Therefore, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

F Harrison

INSPECTOR