

## Appeals Received North Sunderland

Between 01/03/2008 and 31/03/2008

Ref No	Address	Description	Date Appeal Lodged
08/00010/REF	2 Marshall Street Fulwell Sunderland SR6 9BG	Erection of front and rear dormers.	06/03/2008

---

## Appeals Determined North Sunderland

Between 01/03/2008 and 31/03/2008

---

Team	Ref No	ADDRESS	Descriptio	Appeal Decision	Date of Decision
N	07/00057/REF	2 Troutbeck Road, Sunderland, SR6 8LA	Erection of two storey extension to side with single storey porch and garage extension to front with single storey laundry extension to rear.	APPC	04/03/2008



# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 February 2008

by **Malcolm Rivett BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

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

The Planning Inspectorate  
4/11 Eagle Wing  
Temple Quay House  
2 The Square  
Temple Quay  
Bristol BS1 6PN

☎ 0117 372 6372  
email: [enquiries@pins.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:enquiries@pins.gsi.gov.uk)

Decision date:  
4 March 2008

**Appeal Ref: APP/J4525/A/07/2059795**

**2 Troutbeck Road, Seaburn Dene, Sunderland, SR6 8LA**

- 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 Mark Finkle and Tracey Finkle against the decision of Sunderland City Council.
- The application Ref 07/02283/FUL, dated 8 May 2007, was refused by notice dated 10 July 2007.
- The development proposed is two storey garage, laundry, bedroom and bathroom extension.

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL

- 4 MAR 2008

## Decision

1. I allow the appeal, and grant planning permission for two storey garage, laundry, bedroom and bathroom extension at 2 Troutbeck Road, Seaburn Dene, Sunderland, SR6 8LA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 07/02283/FUL, dated 8 May 2007, and the plans submitted with it, 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 materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

## Main issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupants of no 66 Staveley Road, with particular regard to outlook.

## Reasons

3. The adopted Development Control Guidelines Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) to the City of Sunderland Unitary Development Plan (UDP) indicates that a 2 storey elevation (without main windows) of a residential property should be a minimum of 14m from that of a property with a main window. The proposal would bring the two storey side elevation of the appeal property to within 10.5 - 11m of the rear of no 66 Staveley Road.
4. I recognise that the houses are situated relatively close to each other and that the appeal property is on slightly higher ground than no 66. However, I consider that the side elevation of the proposal being around 3m closer to no

66 than at present would not cause it to be significantly more intrusive, nor would it materially affect the existing outlook from the rear windows of the neighbouring property, particularly as a substantial part of the elevation would, in any case, be obscured by no 66's pitched roof garage. I have also borne in mind that from the rear, first floor, bedroom window of no 66 the proposal would occupy around only 40 degrees of the overall field of vision and that an open aspect to the front and rear of the appeal property would be retained. Therefore, whilst I appreciate that the proposal does not accord with the guidance in the SPG, I conclude that it would be unlikely to cause any significant harm to the living conditions of the occupants of no 66. I find that it thus has no conflict with policy B2 of the UDP which states that extensions to existing buildings should respect the best qualities of nearby properties.

5. I note that the occupants of no 66 have not objected to the proposal and this has added some weight to my decision.
6. For the above reasons I conclude that the appeal should be allowed. I agree with the Council that a materials condition is necessary in order to ensure the satisfactory appearance of the proposal, although I am satisfied that requiring the extension to match the existing property would achieve this objective.

*Malcolm Rivett*

INSPECTOR