



Planning Services

COMMITTEE REPORT

APPEAL UPDATE

DECISIONS RECEIVED:

APPEAL REF: APP/X1355/D/13/2190709

LPA REF: 3/2012/0430

APPEAL AGAINST THE REFUSAL OF PLANNING PERMISSION FOR THE ERECTION OF TWO STOREY PITCHED ROOF EXTENSIONS TO THE FRONT, INCLUDING CENTRAL GLAZED EXTENSION, INCORPORATING A STUDY WITHIN THE ROOF SPACE AND DETACHED DOUBLE GARAGE TO THE FRONT OF 13, ETHERLEY GRANGE, BISHOP AUCKLAND DL14 0JZ

1. This appeal relates to an application for extensions and alterations and detached double garage to the front of 13 Etherley Grange, Bishop Auckland.
2. The application was refused under delegated powers on 5 December 2012 for the following reasons:

The Local Planning Authority considers the proposed extension, as a result of its massing, scale, position and height, would appear over dominant and fail to be subordinate to the existing property. The proposals would be unsympathetic to the host dwelling and out of keeping with the character and appearance of the surrounding area. As a result the proposals are considered to be contrary to the requirements of policies GD1(i)(ii), H25 and FPG 5 of the Wear Valley District Local Plan as amended by Saved and Expired Policies September 2007.

The Local Planning Authority considers the proposed detached garage, as a result of its form, size and location, in a prominent position to the front of the dwelling, would be highly visible in longer views, particularly from the west. The proposals would result in a development out of keeping with the character and appearance of the main dwelling itself, the surrounding area, failing to be appropriate to the setting of the neighbouring buildings. As a result the proposed garage is considered to be contrary to the requirements of policies GD1(i)(ii), H25 and FPG 5 of the Wear Valley District Local Plan as amended by Saved and Expired Policies September 2007.

3. The appeal was **allowed** subject to conditions. In arriving at the decision the Inspector considered the main issue to be the effect of the development upon the appearance and character of the host dwelling and surrounding environment.
4. The Inspector agreed with the Council that the scale and nature of the extensions are such that they could not reasonably be described as subordinate to the host dwelling. However, he considered that material considerations warranted making an exception in this case. This included the removal of an existing unsympathetic extension. Overall the scheme would result in a house in broad sympathy with its neighbour, a material improvement to the appearance and character of the existing dwelling and an improvement to the street scene.

5. The Inspector considered that although the proposed garage would stand in a prominent position and be visible in longer views, he considered the proposal to positively reflect existing pattern of development.
6. No costs were awarded to either the appellant or the Local Authority.

RECOMMENDATION

7. That the decision is noted.

