
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 January 2016

by K A Ellison BA, MPhil, MRTPI

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

Decision date: 26 January 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/A4520/D/15/3137650
49 Readhead Road SOUTH SHIELDS NE34 6HR

- 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 and Mrs Murtah against the decision of South Tyneside Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref ST/0885/15/HFUL dated 3 September 2015 was refused by notice dated 23 October 2015.
 - The development proposed is described as: Resubmission of permission ref ST/0678/15/HFUL for pitched roofs to existing flat roofed front dormer, side bay window, and porch. New brick piers and railings to existing boundary wall to a maximum height of 1.8m. Replace existing pedestrian access gate with vehicular access/gates and new footpath crossing from Readhead Road. Amended to include pitched roof to existing flat roofed side dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the existing dwelling and the street scene.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a semi detached bungalow which sits at the corner of Readhead Road and Grosvenor Drive. At present, the dormer windows to the front and side are both flat-roofed. Planning permission was recently granted for various alterations, including a pitched roof to the front dormer. The appeal plans indicate this would extend out at ridge height. There is already a rear dormer which extends out at this level. The proposed pitched roof to the side dormer would also extend out from the ridge.
 4. The existing front and side dormers sit some way below the ridgeline so that the proposed pitched roofs would represent a notable increase in the size and bulk of this part of the roof. When viewed as a whole, the proposed works would result in an excessively large addition which would not be sympathetic to the appearance or character of the original dwelling. Due to the corner location, the front and side elevations of the bungalow are readily visible from the street so that the overbearing appearance of the enlarged roof would also detract from the street scene. This harm would outweigh any adverse effect associated with the side dormer being the only remaining flat roofed element of
-

the property if the existing planning permission was to be implemented. As such, I consider that the proposal would be contrary to policy DM1 of the Local Development Framework, with regard to its requirement that development should be designed to convey sensitive consideration of the surroundings. It would also fail to meet the objectives of SPD9 with regard to ensuring that the visual impact of a proposal is acceptable.

5. During my site visit, I took note of the side dormers in nearby Southfield Road but their visual impact is more limited since they are not situated on a street corner. Also, I take the point that permitted development rights would apply in other circumstances. However, this proposal is unacceptable due to the effect of the works as a whole, along with their visibility within the street.
6. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should not succeed.

K.A. Ellison

Inspector