



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 March 2010

by **Susan Heywood BSc(Hons) MCD**
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

Decision date:
4 March 2010

Appeal Ref: APP/N1350/D/10/2121294

10 Walton Heath, Darlington, Durham, DL1 3HZ

- 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 Michael Hodgson against the decision of Darlington Borough Council.
- The application Ref 09/00692/FUL, dated 6 October 2009, was refused by notice dated 1 December 2009.
- The development is described as: "*proposed two storey extension (8000 long x 6400 wide x 7800 high) proposed single storey lean to roof extension (2700 long x 1900 wide x 3500 high)*".

Decision

1. I dismiss the appeal insofar as it relates to the two storey side extension. I allow the appeal insofar as it relates to the single storey side extension and I grant planning permission for a single storey side extension at 10 Walton Heath, Darlington, Durham, DL1 3HZ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 09/00692/FUL, dated 6 October 2009, 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 development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the plans (Revision A) submitted with the application and appeal, so far as relevant to that part of the development hereby permitted.

Reasons

2. The Council are concerned about the visual impact of the proposed extension and I agree that the main issue in this appeal is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the existing building and surrounding area.
3. The development would involve the erection of a small lean-to side extension to the north of the existing dwelling (not a roof extension as stated on the application forms) and a two storey extension to the south. The proposed single storey extension would be relatively small and unobtrusive and I note that the Council raise no objections to this part of the proposal. I agree with the Council's view and consider that, as this part of the proposal could be constructed on its own, this should be allowed.
4. However, the front of the appeal property is prominent both when viewed along Troon Avenue and from the open space to the front. There is a substantial

garden to the south of the property which could accommodate an appropriately sized extension. But, the two storey extension currently proposed would be a large and prominent addition to the dwelling. The width of this extension would more than double the width of the existing dwelling. As a result, the extension would appear overly dominant in the street and out of proportion with the original house. I also agree with the Council that the windows in the front elevation of the extension would be too widely spaced and would not sit comfortably in that elevation.

5. I note the Council's concerns that the extension would be flush with the rear of the existing house. When viewed from the rear, the dwelling is less prominent and the extension would be tucked into a corner of the street. As such, I do not consider the lack of a set-back to the rear would cause significant visual harm in itself. It is the excessive width of the proposed extension which is of primary concern in this case and for this reason I consider the proposal to be unacceptable. I note the appellant's offer to alter the design of the proposal but he states that he does not wish to reduce the size of the proposed extension.
6. I saw the other extensions referred to by the appellant. However, none of those results in side extensions which more than double the width of the existing dwelling as is proposed in this case. I sympathise with the appellant's desire for additional space and I note that no objections have been received from neighbours. Nevertheless, these factors do not overcome the concerns highlighted above.
7. Policy H12 of The Borough of Darlington Local Plan requires extensions to be in keeping with the design and character of the existing property and with the street scene. This requirement is supplemented in the Council's documents '*Planning Guidance Note 7 Alterations and Extensions to Dwellings*' and '*Distinctly Darlington - Design of New Development Supplementary Planning Document*'. For the above reasons, the proposed two storey side extension would conflict with the aims of this policy and guidance.
8. For the reasons given above I therefore conclude that, whilst the single storey extension would be acceptable, the proposed two storey side extension would harm the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the surrounding area. The appeal should therefore be allowed in part and dismissed in part.
9. For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning, a condition is required to ensure that the single storey extension is constructed in accordance with the submitted plans, so far as they are relevant to that part of the development.

Susan Heywood

INSPECTOR