
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 May 2019

By R Jones BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1st July 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/N1350/D/19/3225529

354 Coniscliffe Road, Darlington DL3 8AG

- 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 and Mrs Simpson against the decision of Darlington Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 18/00812/FUL, dated 31 August 2018, was refused by notice dated 20 February 2019.
 - The development proposed is rear extension and creation of room in roofspace.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for rear extension and creation of room in roofspace at 354 Coniscliffe Road, Darlington DL3 8AG in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 18/00812/FUL, dated 31 August 2018, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Drawing No 18784-01A (Existing Layout); Drawing No 18784-02C (Proposed Plans); Drawing No 18784-03D (Proposed Elevations); and Drawing No 18784-04B (Site Plans).
 - 3) The external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the construction of the existing building

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on i) the living conditions of 352 Coniscliffe Road, with regards loss of natural light and ii) the character of 352 and 354 Coniscliffe Road, as a pair of bungalows.

Reasons

Living conditions

3. The appeal site comprises of 354 Coniscliffe Road (No 354), which forms one of a pair of semi-detached bungalows with 352 Coniscliffe Road (No 352). The proposal is to extend the bungalow to the rear over ground floor with dormer windows to the rear and side to accommodate two bedrooms and a bathroom in the roof space.

4. The extension to the rear is stepped. In part, it would be very close to the common boundary with No 352 extending around 4.8m from the existing elevation into an existing enclosed yard. I saw from my site visit that there is a high close boarded timber fence on the boundary alongside a mature hedge in the garden of No 352. The proposed extension would extend above the fence by around 1.1m up to the existing eaves of the roof.
5. There is a ground floor window on the rear elevation to No 352 and an area of decking close to the boundary. The rear of the bungalow is north facing and would therefore benefit from natural light for the majority of the day. Whilst the rear extension would be in breach of the 45 degree line guidance, given the orientation of the bungalow and height of the existing fence and hedge, the loss of natural light would not be to such an extent to cause harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of No 352.
6. Consequently, I find the proposal would comply with Policy H12 of the Borough of Darlington Local Plan (1997) because it maintains adequate daylight to the principal rooms of neighbours.

Character

7. No 354 and 352 are an attractive pair of semi-detached bungalows fronting Coniscliffe Road that are broadly symmetrical in appearance with gable projections and a hipped roof. The proposal is, in part, for a dormer window extension to the side roof slope which would continue the ridge line of the existing roof.
8. Although the dormer would be visible from the street, it has been set behind the existing chimney stack, well back from the front elevation on the rear half of the roof. This would reduce its prominence and the dormer would only become clearly visible outside 356 Coniscliffe Road, which is next door. From this location, the symmetry of the pair of semi-detached bungalows cannot be seen and as such the extension would not unbalance the composition.
9. I saw from my site visit that views of the front elevation of both bungalows are largely obscured by a substantial tree in the grass verge between the footpath and the road. Given this, and its location on the roof slope, the dormer would not be visually dominant and would be a sympathetic extension to the existing bungalow.
10. I therefore find there would be no harm to the character of the pair of bungalows and the proposals would be consistent with LP Policy H12 because they are in keeping with the character, design and external appearance of the property.

Conditions

11. I have had regard to the conditions that have been suggested by the Council. In addition to a condition imposing the standard time limit upon the permission, in order to provide certainty regarding what has been granted planning permission, it is necessary to attach a condition specifying approved drawings. It is also necessary to attach a condition requiring that the development be constructed using materials that match the existing dwelling to ensure that the extension integrates well.

Conclusion

12. For the above reasons and having regard to all other matters raised I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

R. Jones

INSPECTOR