



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 August 2019

by Graeme Robbie BA(Hons) BPI MRTPI

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

Decision date: 30 August 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/M4510/D/19/3229592

2 Rosewood Cottages, Hexham Road, Newcastle Upon Tyne NE15 9DX

- 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 & Mrs George Bullock against the decision of Newcastle-upon-Tyne City Council.
 - The application Ref 2019/0326/01/DET, dated 27 February 2019, was refused by notice dated 18 April 2019.
 - The development proposed is a second storey extension over existing ground floor kitchen.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for erection of porch to front following demolition of existing porch and first floor extension to rear above existing kitchen at 2 Rosewood Cottages, Hexham Road, Newcastle Upon Tyne NE15 9DX in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2019/0326/01/DET, dated 27 February 2019, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans and documents: location plan; 03 Site location; 01a Existing floor plans; 01b Existing elevations; 02a Proposed floor plans; 02b Proposed elevations.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Procedural Matters

2. The proposal was initially described on the planning application form as 'a second storey extension over existing ground floor kitchen'. However, it is clear from the accompanying plans and drawings, and the Council's decision notice and officer report, that the proposal also included the construction of a replacement porch at the front of the property. I have adopted the development description subsequently set out on the Council's decision notice in my decision above as it more comprehensively describes the proposal set out on the submitted plans and elevations.
3. Both parties have drawn my attention to an approved alternative scheme for a second storey extension and replacement porch¹. I also saw at the time of my

¹ LPA Ref No: 2018/1133/01/DET

visit to the site that the porch at the front of the property bore a very close resemblance to that set out in the appeal proposal before me. As it is not part of the Council's case that they object to the porch, and I have no other evidence before me that would lead me to reach a different conclusion to that of the Council, I restrict my consideration of the appeal to the proposed second storey extension and have determined the appeal accordingly.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a sturdy semi-detached dwelling in a predominantly residential area. As with other adjacent dwellings that front on to Hexham Road, No. 2 benefits from a lengthy south facing rear garden which slopes gently down towards the rear garden boundary. The long gardens, which feature a variety of outbuildings, separate the older houses here from more recent mid- to late- twentieth century residential development behind. There is a wide driveway gap between Nos. 2 and 3 which provides shared vehicular access from Hexham Road to the rears of Nos. 1 to 4.
6. No. 2 has previously been extended at the rear with a full-width, flat roofed single storey extension. There is a similarly proportioned extension at the rear of the adjoining property (No. 1) and a smaller lean-to rear extension at the rear of No. 3.
7. Although the proposed extension would extend across almost the entire width of the host building's rear elevation, it would not be an unwieldy or excessively large extension. Its rearward projection, which would match that of the existing flat roofed ground floor kitchen extension, would be limited whilst its roofline and eaves levels would be clearly and substantially below those of the main house. It would therefore quite clearly read as a subservient and limited addition to the rear of the property, aided somewhat by the extension's second storey flank elevation following that of the ground floor being returned inside the rear corner of the main building.
8. Nor do I consider that it would result in a substantially increased roof volume in the manner suggested by the Council. The gabled rear elevation would result some bulk to the extension's rear face, but its limited overall projection, with correspondingly limited roof, would not appear excessive, either in isolation or in context with the host building. Taking these factors together, I do not consider that the proposed extension would result in an overly dominant or intrusive form of extension at the rear of No. 2.
9. I acknowledge that the Council's Householder Design Guide 'Extending Your Home' (HDG) considers two storey rear extensions likely to be problematic. However, the issues that the HDG raises in relation to two storey rear extensions seems to me to be focused on the effect in terms of outlook and light to adjoining properties, rather than the form that such extensions should take. Such concerns are not raised by the Council in their refusal reason and, having viewed the appeal site and noted the open south facing rear garden and generous degree of separation from No. 3, I do not consider the proposal to be in conflict with the HDG.

10. A loss of spaciousness is cited by the Council as resulting from the proposal, but I do not consider that that would be the result of the proposal. The proposed extension's limited rearward projection and lower ridge / eaves level would limit the visibility of the extension in oblique views between Nos. 2 and 3 from Hexham Road. These factors would maintain the degree of spaciousness evident between the properties when viewed from the front, whilst the sense of openness experienced at the rear and created by the lengthy and open gardens would be largely unaffected by the proposal.
11. The proposal would be constructed of random natural stone under a natural slate roof, window openings would feature stone heads and cills. It would also successfully build upon the existing ground floor extension in a measured and limited manner, incorporating materials and features typically found on the host property and adjoining properties. Although it would extend across the majority of the property's rear elevation, I have not been directed towards any policy or guidance that expressly prohibits such a form of extension. Instead, I am satisfied that the extension's limited rearward projection, lower ridge and eaves levels and modest proportions would respond positively to, and avoid harm to, local distinctiveness and character and would amount to the high quality design sought by Core Strategy and Urban Core Plan policy CS15 and saved Unitary Development Plan policies EN1.1 and H2. Nor would it be in conflict with the Council's Householder Design Guide 'Extending Your Home'.

Conditions

12. I have considered the conditions suggested by the Council as set out within the appeal questionnaire in light of the Framework and Planning Practice Guidance. Other than time limit, approved plans and matching materials conditions, which I consider are necessary in order to provide certainty and in the interests of character and appearance, no further conditions have been suggested. Nor, from all that I have seen and read, do I consider that any further conditions are necessary.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons set out, and having considered all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Graeme Robbie

INSPECTOR