
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 March 2016

by Roy Merrett BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 8th April 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/A4520/D15/3141129

81 Temple Park Road, South Shields, South Tyneside NE34 0PR

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Kris Leighton against the decision of South Tyneside Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref ST/0613/15/HFUL, dated 29 June 2015, was refused by notice dated 7 October 2015.
 - The development proposed is a 2 storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a 2 storey side extension at 81 Temple Park Road, South Shields, South Tyneside NE34 0PR in accordance with the terms of the application Ref ST/0613/15/HFUL, dated 29 June 2015 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: Site Location Plan; 14011-002; 14011-001 Rev 1.
 - 3) No development shall commence until details of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling, adjoining dwelling and wider street scene.

Reasons

3. Temple Park Road is a long and wide tree-lined street. The appeal site is within part of the street characterised by semi-detached dwellings of relatively simple form and typical appearance for their age. However large expanses of open space opposite and to the side of the site have left development gaps which already disrupt any strong sense of uniformity and visual rhythm in the street scene. The development would not therefore be harmful in this regard.
-

4. Although the extension would be wide, it would not appear excessively so, fitting comfortably within the generous plot width whilst allowing for the retention of some space to the side. The extension would also be set back at first floor level with a ridgeline lower than that of the main roof whilst in keeping with its profile. These factors would help to soften the visual impact of the extension and ensure that it appeared subordinate to the main dwelling.
5. Despite the overall balance in scale between the appeal dwelling and its semi-detached neighbour, the symmetry of the pair is disrupted to a degree by the front porch serving the host property, by differences in the design of the windows and by the width of the appeal plot. In addition, the orientation of the houses running parallel to Temple Park Road means the eye would tend to be drawn towards longer distance views along the curve of the street rather than the appearance of the dwelling in relation to its neighbour. Therefore when considering the above factors, whilst the extension would further unbalance the symmetry, the importance of retaining this feature is diminished.
6. For the above reasons the proposal would be in keeping with Policy DM1 of the South Tyneside Local Development Framework 2011 which seeks to secure high quality design. I acknowledge that it would not be in strict accordance with the design guidelines set out in the Council's Supplementary Planning Document 9: Householder Developments 2014. However the specific circumstances of this case as considered above mean the proposal would not result in harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling, adjoining dwelling or wider street scene.

Conditions

7. Conditions specifying the plans and details of external building materials are required to safeguard the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

8. For the above reasons, and having regard to all other points raised, I consider that the appeal should succeed.

Roy Merrett

INSPECTOR