



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 October 2017

by Graeme Robbie BA(Hons) BPI MRTPI

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

Decision date: 19 October 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/M4510/D/17/3179228

9 McCracken Close, Gosforth, Newcastle Upon Tyne NE3 2DW

- 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 Gordon Watson against the decision of Newcastle-upon-Tyne City Council.
 - The application Ref 2017/0631/01/DET, dated 28 April 2017, was refused by notice dated 23 June 2017.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a single storey extension to side and dormer windows to front.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to the proposal for dormer windows to front. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to the erection of a single storey extension to side and planning permission is granted for the erection of a single storey extension to side at 9 McCracken Close, Gosforth, Newcastle Upon Tyne NE3 2DW in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref: 2017/0631/01/DET, and the plans submitted with it, so far as relevant to that part of the development hereby permitted, and 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 insofar as they relate to the single storey side extension: dwg no 00 and PO-20-100 Rev P1.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the single storey extension to side hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Procedural Matters

2. The application was originally submitted with the development description set out above but, additionally, also with reference to a dormer window to the rear. The dormer window to the rear was, however, subsequently deleted from the proposal during the course of the Council's consideration of the application. I am satisfied that, from the evidence before me, the Council considered the proposal on the basis of the description set out in the header above, and so shall I.
3. For the reasons set out below, I find the proposed single storey side extension to be acceptable and it is clearly severable both physical and functionally from

the proposed roof alterations. Therefore, I intend to issue a split decision in this case and grant planning permission for the single storey side extension.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a large detached house within a residential cul-de-sac of similarly scaled and designed dwellings. The houses within the cul-de-sac are not of a single uniform design or appearance; rather they are broadly comprised of two distinct house types. There is, however, a certain consistency of approach evident in terms of the scale and character of the houses and, despite the two differing house types, also in terms of their overall appearance.
6. The appeal property sits back from the shared surface road, behind a driveway and parking area. As with the majority of the properties within the cul-de-sac, the front garden area is heavily landscaped with trees, shrubs and hedges. These create a pleasingly verdant, sylvan setting, but also one which diffuses views along the street, and also those of individual properties and their sometimes prominent garage blocks.
7. The proposal can essentially be split into two distinct elements; the proposed single storey extension to the side and the proposed dormer window on the front facing roof slope. The proposed single storey side extension would be located on the side elevation of No. 9, essentially infilling the space created in the angle between the main house's gable elevation and the front face of an existing single storey side element which is located towards the rear of the gable elevation.
8. The Council's decision notice takes exception only to the proposed dormer window, and the officer report confirms that the side extension is considered to be 'of a design and scale to complement the host dwelling'. Having viewed the site and considered the context of its surroundings, I agree. This element of the proposal would be a discrete addition to the dwelling, largely screened from views along the cul-de-sac and the front of the dwelling by the large detached garage structure. It would not, I conclude, cause harm to the character or appearance of either the host property or the cul-de-sac more widely.
9. I am satisfied therefore that this element of the proposal would comply with the aims and requirements of policy CS15 of the Core Strategy and Urban Core Plan for Gateshead and Newcastle upon Tyne (CSUCP) and policy EN1.1 of the Newcastle upon Tyne Unitary Development Plan (UDP). This element of the proposal would also achieve one of the National Planning Policy Framework's core planning principles that planning should always seek to secure high quality design.
10. Turning to the proposed dormer window, it would be located centrally between the two projecting bays on the host dwelling's front facing roof slope. It would however also be positioned relatively high up within the roof slope and would, as a consequence, be higher than the ridge levels of the bays. The dormer's distinctly horizontal emphasis would sit somewhat awkwardly with the lower ridge levels and greater vertical emphasis of the bays. This would create visual

conflict and unnecessary clutter within the roof slope of the host property that would erode the broad similarities between the dwellings within McCracken Close which I found to be present. This would, in find, be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property and of McCracken Close as a whole.

11. The element of the proposal that relates to the dormer windows would therefore fail to respond positively to the design, character or appearance of the host property, or to that of McCracken Close, contrary to CSUCP policy CS15 and UDP policy EN1.1. I acknowledge that the property is not located within a conservation area. However, the policies above seek to secure high quality design in all instances, something also reflected in the Framework as one of its core planning principles, and I do not consider that the dormer window, in the form before me, would secure that aim.
12. I note that there have been no objections to the proposal from occupiers of neighbouring properties. I note too that there have been no objections to the proposal in highways terms and that the Council are satisfied that the proposal would not cause harm to the living conditions of occupiers of neighbouring properties. These though are only neutral effects, and do not outweigh the harm that I have identified above. I have also noted the appellant's reasons for seeking to extend the property but these are not material considerations or circumstances to which I can ascribe any great weight and are not sufficient to outweigh the harm that I have identified above.

Conclusion and Conditions

13. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed insofar as it relates to the single storey side extension and dismissed insofar as it relates to the proposed front dormer window.
14. In relation to the element of the appeal that I conclude should be allowed, I have considered the conditions suggested by the Council against the Framework and Planning Practice Guidance. In addition to a time limit condition, I have amended the wording of the plans condition to reflect the nature of the split decision that I have reached. A condition to ensure that the facing materials of the proposed single storey side extension match those of the main house is necessary in the interests of character and appearance.

Graeme Robbie

INSPECTOR