



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 September 2025

by **A Hartley, LLB (Hons), Solicitor, MBA**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 08 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/A4520/D/25/3371835

10 Crawley Avenue, Hebburn, South Tyneside NE31 2LU

- 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 Miss Zoe McGrath against the decision of South Tyneside Council.
 - The application Ref is 250278.
 - The proposed development a two-storey side extension, single-storey front extension and single-storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. I have taken the description of development from the Council's decision notice as it more clearly describes the proposed development.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal property is one half of a pair of semi-detached dwellings set back from the road with gardens to the front. The pair of dwellings maintain a pleasing symmetry.
5. Many of the semi-detached properties in the immediate surrounding area have been extended and modified so that the pleasing symmetry and regular gaps are no longer the dominant feature in the immediate street scene of Crawley Avenue and Blue House Road. Further along Crawley Avenue and in the wider area, the gaps between buildings and symmetry of roofscape have generally been maintained at first floor level.
6. My attention has been drawn to the fact that the extension at No.17 Crawley Avenue is set back from the front elevation and set down from the ridge height in line with the South Tyneside Supplementary Planning Document 9: Householder Developments (2010 revised 2014) (SPD9) requirements.

7. The design of the two-storey side extension before me does not set down the roof ridge height or set back the elevation from the front elevation of the host dwelling. It therefore would not appear subservient. In this respect the proposal would conflict with requirements of the SPD9 and would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling. The side extension would also reduce the already limited gaps between dwellings. It would further erode the remaining symmetry and rhythm of roofscape that presently contribute positively to the character of the surrounding area.
8. The single-storey front extension would exceed the maximum level of forward projection cited in SPD9. Although there are examples of other front extensions in the area, due to the degree of projection, the appeal development would appear unduly prominent as it would disrupt the evident building line and thus be an incongruous and unsympathetic addition within the street scene.
9. For the above reasons, the two-storey side extension and the single-storey front extension would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. However, the single-storey rear extension would be modest in size and scale. It would not affect the roofscape. It would be a subservient addition to the property. The location at the rear would not result in substantial visual harm to the street scene. However, the single-storey rear extension would extend from the rear of the proposed two-storey side extension and is therefore not clearly severable from the appeal development. I am thus unable to issue a split decision in this case.
10. My attention has been drawn to other examples of extensions in Blue House Road and Crawley Avenue. However, the effects I have identified above relate primarily to the pair of semi-detached properties to which the proposal before me relates.
11. When taken as a whole, the proposed development would therefore cause harm to the identified character and appearance of the area and conflict with Policy DM1(A) of the South Tyneside Local Development Framework Development Management Policies (2011) and SPD9 which seek to ensure that development is designed to convey sensitive consideration of its surroundings, having particular regard to, amongst other things, scale, proportion and alignment. It would also conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks to ensure that development is sympathetic to local character including the surrounding built environment, and which establishes or maintains a strong sense of place.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, the proposal conflicts with the development plan when read as a whole. There are no material considerations that have been shown to carry sufficient weight to indicate a decision otherwise than in accordance with it. The appeal should therefore be dismissed.

A Hartley

INSPECTOR