
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 October 2025 by J Reed MPlan

Decision by A M Nilsson BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 January 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/J4525/D/25/3371746

20 Crosslea Avenue, Sunderland SR3 1LT

- 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 Alan Campion against the decision of Sunderland City Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00909/FUL.
 - The development proposed is erection of rear dormer window, porch and new boundary wall.
-

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.

Preliminary Matters

3. The Council raised no objections to the wall or porch as part of the proposals, and I have no reason to form a different view to this. As a result, the main issue relates to the dormer to the rear.
4. Amended plans were submitted during the course of the application following dialogue between the parties. The Council considered the application on the basis of those amended plans, which I take to represent the proposal for the purposes of this appeal.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the dormer window on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

6. The appeal dwelling is a red brick semi-detached dwelling with a dormer window to its front elevation and the dormer subject to the appeal to its rear loft space. The street and surrounding area consists of other similar properties with small modest dormers to the front and rear roof slopes which creates symmetry between the semi-detached pairs.
7. From my site visit I saw that the development had commenced. The rear dormer occupies a large portion of the roof space as a result of its depth and particularly its width. This creates a large, boxy and dominant addition to the rear roof slope. This

appears as an overbearing extension and adversely alters the existing dwelling's simple character and design. The prominence of the dormer is further exacerbated by its contrasting materials to the existing dwelling and limited amount of glazing which increases its dominance and creates a solid monotonous appearance. Furthermore, by virtue of its size and detailed design, the dormer harms the existing quality of the area and the symmetry between the appeal dwelling and its semi-detached neighbour, due to it being clearly visible from Crosslea Avenue in both directions.

8. I acknowledge that there are various examples of rear dormers within the street scene. However, these are generally more modest additions to the roofscape which are small in depth and width and are a form of design reflecting the subservience of the attic floor of the properties, unlike the impact of the appeal development. I also note the previous approval in the locality referenced by the appellant for a similar dormer. However, I do not have the full planning background for this development. It is also a different proposal in a different context, and I therefore give this limited weight. I have considered the appeal scheme on its own individual planning merits. Turning to the other historic dormers in the area referenced by the appellant, I am satisfied none of these are sufficiently similar to the proposal before me in regard to the combination of their scale, massing and material palette. In any case, I have considered the appeal proposal on its own merits.
9. In conclusion, the development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area and host dwelling. Accordingly, the proposal would conflict with Policy BH1 of the Sunderland City Council Core Strategy and Development Plan 2015-2033 (2020) and the guidance within Section 2 of the Sunderland City Council Development Management Supplementary Planning Document (2021) which both seek, amongst other things, 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.

Conclusion and Recommendation

10. The scheme conflicts with the development plan taken as a whole, and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it.
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.

A M Nilsson

INSPECTOR