The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 January 2023

by F Harrison BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 January 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/A4520/D/22/3311338
55 Summerhill Road, South Shields, NE34 6RZ

- 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 Neil Smith against the decision of South Tyneside Council.
- The application Ref ST/0804/22/HFUL, dated 21 September 2022, was refused by notice dated 15 November 2022.
- The development proposed is demolish existing single storey rear conservatory, construct new first floor side extension over existing garage/sun lounge (en-suite bedroom extension). Construct new single storey kitchen/family/dining room extension to rear with associated alterations to door/window arrangements of roof, with 3no. roof lights. Change existing hipped roof to porch/garage to 'lean to' roof.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two-storey semi-detached house that has previously been extended at ground floor level. It is on a corner plot in a residential area characterised by similar semi-detached properties finished in brick with tiled gabled roofs. The similar styles of properties and the regular separation and set back from Summerhill Road results in a relatively spacious, consistent, and harmonious character and appearance.

4. The proposed first-floor extension would disrupt the consistent building line along Summerhill Road and its incongruous hipped pitched roof design would draw the eye, would not sit comfortably with the predominance of gable roofs adjacent to it and would look harmfully out of place on this prominent corner plot. Consequently, due to its siting and design the proposal would be a discordant feature that would detract from the otherwise harmonious character and appearance of the area

5. While the existing ground floor side extension projects beyond the building line along Summerhill Road, it is largely screened by the boundary treatment and is not a conspicuous feature in the street scene. However, I observed during my site visit that there is an absence of two storey extensions immediately around the appeal site.

6. I have considered the examples of existing two-storey extensions, of which there are a large number, and therefore a feature of the wider area. The context of the examples differs in overall appearance and relationship with the street scene. They are on different streets, would not be seen with the appeal scheme and as such are not directly comparable. As such, a decision to refuse permission at the appeal site would not be inconsistent with other decisions that have been taken in the area.

7. Overall, the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area, in conflict with Policy DM1 A) of the South Tyneside Local Development Framework Development Management Policies (2011). This policy, amongst other things, seeks development of a design that conveys a sensitive consideration of its surroundings.

8. The proposal would be contrary to guidance set out in SPD 9: Householder Developments (2010, revised 2014) which advises that side extensions can have a particularly significant impact on the street scene and on corner plots, and should not interrupt consistent building lines where present in the street. It is also contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (2021) in Section 12 regarding the need to achieve well designed places.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above, having considered the development plan as a whole, the approach in the Framework, and all other material considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

F Harrison

INSPECTOR