

---

## Appeals Received Hetton Houghton and Washington

Between 01/11/2009 and 30/11/2009

Team	Ref No	Address	Description	Date Appeal Lodged
HE	09/00043/REF	Eppleton Cricket Club Church Road Hetton le Hole Houghton-Le-Spring DH5 9AJ	Installation of 12m steel monopole with dual band, dual polar antennae and equipment cabinet.	17/11/2009
HO	09/00041/REF	Land Rear Of 4A Front Street Fence Houses Houghton-Le-Spring DH4 6LR	Erection of 14m slimline street work pole with cabinet and fenced enclosure at base (amended description)	04/11/2009

---

Appeals Determined Hetton Houghton and Washington  
Between 01/11/2009 and 30/11/2009

---

Team	Ref No	Address	Description	Appeal Decision	Date of Decision
HO	09/00028/REF	154 Burn Park Road□Houghton-Le- Spring□DH4 5DH□	Erection of a two storey side extension.	DISMIS	02/11/2009



# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 October 2009

by **Peter Eggleton 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:  
2 November 2009

**Appeal Ref: APP/J4525/A/09/2108823**

**154 Burn Park Road, Houghton Le Spring, Tyne and Wear DH4 5DH.**

- 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 Ms Vicky Adamson against the decision of Sunderland City Council.
- The application Ref 09/01214/FUL, dated 4 March 2009, was refused by notice dated 15 July 2009.
- The development proposed is to extend the ground floor extension and to provide a first floor extension.

## Decision

1. I dismiss the appeal.

## Main Issue

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

## Reasons

3. The proposal would result in a two storey addition to the side of the dwelling. The property is located close to the road junction and adjacent to an open corner of land which accommodates a medium size tree. The property across the road is also located adjacent to an open corner with a similar tree and that dwelling has already had very similar works undertaken.
4. The ridge height and front elevation of the extension would match that of the existing house. Because the land to the side of the property is open and there is a road between this house and its neighbour, there is no prospect of the development significantly closing the gap between the dwellings or appearing as a terrace. The dwelling does not have a distinctive design and the building materials would not be difficult to match. I also do not consider that the proposed changes would unbalance this pair of properties. I am not satisfied that it would be necessary in this case to set the ridge line down and the front elevation back. Given the similarity of designs, it would actually provide some symmetry with the development opposite. I also consider that replacing the existing flat roof to the front with a pitched roof would improve the appearance of the dwelling.
5. Although I consider that the extension would be of an acceptable design, I have significant reservations with regard to the setting of this property and in particular the impact the proposal would have on the adjacent tree. This tree

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL  
RECEIVED  
02 NOV 2009  
SUNDERLAND CITY COUNCIL

and the tree opposite create a distinctive and attractive gateway to the housing area beyond. Works would be required within the canopy spread of this tree and I have not been provided with any evidence to demonstrate that the foundations would not harm the tree. The canopy would also need to be significantly reduced and re-shaped and this would result in the appearance of the tree being harmed. Even if the tree could be retained, its relationship with the side gable would be cramped and entirely unsatisfactory. In this respect, the proposal would harm the setting of the dwelling and detract from the character and appearance of the area. It would fail to satisfy Policy B2 of the Unitary Development Plan (UDP) which includes a requirement that development respects or enhances the locality.

6. The Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance *Development Control Guidelines* (SPG) sets out general criteria for considering extensions. I can give significant weight to it as it has been adopted and is in general conformity with the UDP. It requires that extensions are subordinate and in harmony with their surroundings. When considering side extensions specifically, it makes particular reference to terracing. Terracing would not be an issue and I am satisfied that given the circumstances, the extension need not be subordinate as this would not improve its design. However, it would fail to satisfy the SPG because of the unsatisfactory impact on its surroundings. The Council also has an emerging Supplementary Planning Document *Household Alterations and Extensions* (SPD) which I can afford some weight given its progress towards adoption. This also seeks the subservience of extensions and the maintenance of the character of dwellings and the quality of the street. This proposal would not achieve the latter of these objectives.
7. The development opposite is a material consideration that I must afford considerable weight given the clear similarities. That development appears to have had an impact on the adjacent tree as its crown is now off-centre. This has harmed the appearance of the tree. This proposal would be more imposing in relation to the tree due to the differences in level. It would also appear that the open land in this case is smaller and the development would be located slightly closer to the tree. Given these differences, I consider that this extension would have an even less satisfactory relationship with the tree and a more adverse impact on the surroundings. This assumes that the foundations would not harm its health which has not been demonstrated.
8. Reference has been made to other extensions that have been accepted but I have not been satisfied that these are entirely comparable. In any event, I have to consider this proposal on its own particular merits and overall, whilst I have considered all the matters put forward by the appellant, including the lack of objections, I am not satisfied that these outweigh my concern that this proposal would detract from the character and appearance of the area. I therefore dismiss the appeal.

*Peter Eggleton*

INSPECTOR

---