

Appeals Received Hetton Houghton and Washington Between 01/02/2012 and 29/02/2012

<u>Team Ref No</u>	<u>Address</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Appeal Decision</u>	<u>Date Of Decision</u>
--------------------	----------------	--------------------	------------------------	-------------------------

None Received

Appeals Determined Hetton Houghton and Washington
Between 01/02/2012 and 29/02/2012

Team	Ref No	Address	Description	Appeal Decision	Date of Decision
W	12/00006/REF	10 Whinway Albany Washington NE37 1AU	Erection of a single storey extension to front	DISMIS	10/02/2012



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 February 2012

by Malcolm Rivett BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

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

Decision date: 10 February 2012

Appeal Ref: APP/J4525/D/12/2168104

10 Whinway, Albany, Washington, Tyne and Wear, NE37 1AU

- 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 Gary Gregg against the decision of Sunderland City Council.
 - The application Ref 11/03027/FUL, dated 6 October 2011, was refused by notice dated 5 December 2011.
 - The development proposed is single storey 3m extension to front of dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues of the appeal are the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area and on the living conditions of the occupants of 9 Whinway, having particular regard to outlook.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is the end dwelling in a terrace of houses featuring flat roofs and flat-roofed porches. Although I understand that the east facing elevation of the terrace is not generally used as the primary entrance to the houses, it very much has the appearance of the front of the properties and is prominent in the area generally, being visible from a number of footways and streets to the south east.
4. The proposed extension would appear incongruous as a result of its excessive depth, projecting forward of the other, already set forward, houses in the terrace, and because of its pitched roof which would be out of keeping with the flat roofs of the properties. I recognise that, in contrast with the others in the terrace, no 9's porch has a pitched roof, although this is nowhere near the scale of the appeal proposal. Bearing in mind its size and prominence, the scheme would cause material harm to the character and appearance of the terrace and the area generally.
5. Situated virtually on the shared boundary with no 9, and projecting forward of this dwelling by 3m with a height of up to 3.8m or so, the extension would be very dominant in the outlook from no 9's main downstairs front window. Bearing in mind that the view from this window in the opposite direction is already restricted by no 9's own porch and the projection of no 8, I consider that the scheme would unacceptably harm the outlook from this property, to the potential detriment of the living conditions of its occupants. I appreciate

that the appellant has recently felled trees in his garden although, noting the distance of their stumps from no 9, it appears to me that they would have been unlikely to have the dominating effect of the proposed extension.

6. Therefore, in respect of its effects on both the character and appearance of the area and the living conditions of neighbouring residents, the scheme conflicts with the requirement of policy B2 of the adopted *City of Sunderland Unitary Development Plan* that extensions respect and enhance the best qualities of nearby properties and the locality.
7. I recognise that the current occupants of no 9 have not objected to the proposal, although it is appropriate for me to also consider its effect on potential future occupiers of the property. I also understand that no 9's residents themselves have plans for a front extension which, dependent on its form, could negate the dominating effect of the appeal scheme on the neighbouring property. However, given that I have seen no plans of the proposal for no 9, nor is there any guarantee that it would secure planning permission or be constructed, this is not good reason to allow the appeal.
8. For the above reasons, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Malcolm Rivett

INSPECTOR