
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 October 2016

by Elaine Gray MA(Hons) MSc IHBC

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

Decision date: 10 November 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/M4510/D/16/3159888

51 Robsheugh Place, Newcastle upon Tyne NE5 2QU

- 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 Sean Joyce against the decision of Newcastle-upon-Tyne City Council.
 - The application Ref 2016/1182/01/DET, dated 30 July 2016, was refused by notice dated 26 September 2016.
 - The development proposed is erection of two storey extension to side and single storey extension to rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The description of the development varies between the application form and the subsequent documents. I have used the description on the decision notice as it describes the development more succinctly.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal site at 51 Robsheugh Place is located within a predominantly residential area. It occupies a corner location by the junction between Robsheugh Place and St Cuthbert's Road. The proposal would add a new extension to the north-west elevation of the appeal property.
 5. The Council's document entitled 'Extending Your Home – A Design Guide Series' (Design Guide, February 2011) sets out guidelines for the extension of dwellings. It states that many corner plots provide an important space between adjoining streets adding to the spaciousness and open character of the area. It further advises that proposals for extensions should have regard to existing building lines.
 6. The size of the existing garden at No 51 is typical of the suburban layout of the area, which is particularly characterised by more generous plots on the corners adjacent to junctions. The garden plot of No 51 adjoins St Cuthbert's Road, and adds to the open, spacious appearance at the junction. I noted on my visit
-

that the side elevations of the properties on Robsheugh Place and Dissington Place form a consistent building line on the south-east side of St Cuthbert's Road. I observed that a similar pattern occurs on the other side of St Cuthbert's Road.

7. I accept that the design of the new extension and the proposed materials would be in keeping with the existing appearance of the appeal property. However, by infilling part of the garden of No 51, and bringing the built form significantly closer to St Cuthbert's Road, the development would substantially reduce the open character around the junction. It would appear cramped within site, and would break forward of the established building line. It would thus be significantly at odds with the prevailing pattern of development in the vicinity.
8. The appellant has submitted two photomontages showing existing views of the appeal site along St Cuthbert's Road, and comparing these with the same views including the proposed extension. In my view, these demonstrate that the extension would be a bulky addition to No 51 which would significantly reduce the spaciousness of the plot. Whilst a degree of separation would remain between the new side elevation of the extension and the opposite building on Hesleyside Drive, this would not be sufficient to overcome my concerns.
9. My attention has been drawn to the presence of two storey side extensions at 1 Robsheugh Place and 44 Lanercost Drive. However, I have little information regarding the circumstances in which these proposals were found to be acceptable, and so I cannot be certain that either represents a direct parallel to the appeal proposal. I can therefore afford them little weight, and in any case, I have considered the appeal scheme on its own merits.
10. Drawing these factors together, I conclude that the proposal would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area. It would thus conflict with Policy CS15 of the Core Strategy and Urban Core Plan for Gateshead and Newcastle upon Tyne 2010-2030 (March 2015), insofar as it requires new development to respond positively to local distinctiveness and character. It would also conflict with Policy EN1.1 of the Newcastle upon Tyne Unitary Development Plan (January 1998), insofar as it requires development to be integrated into its setting. It would further conflict with the guidance set out in the Design Guide.
11. For those reasons, and taking all other matters into consideration, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Elaine Gray

INSPECTOR