



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 February 2020 by Ifeanyi Chukwujekwu BSc MSc MIEMA
CEnv AssocRTPI

Decision by Chris Preston BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12th March 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/M4510/D/19/3242571

8 Bowden Close, Newcastle Upon Tyne NE13 9GB

- 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 Mrs Sarah McKeown against the decision of Newcastle City Council.
 - The application Ref 2019/1266/01/DET, dated 4 September 2019, was refused by notice dated 19 November 2019.
 - The development proposed is single storey extension to front of house to extend living room and provide a porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the host property and the street scene.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. No.8 is a detached property located on Bowden Close within a new build residential estate known as West Heath in Great Park area of Newcastle upon Tyne. The dominant design characteristics of this property are its roof design which incorporates a combination of mono-pitched roof, gabled roof which tapers down to a flat roof above a two-storey projecting bay at the front. The building also has a strong vertical emphasis to the front facade and is part rendered with blue boarding at side of the property frontage underneath the mono-pitched roof. All these contribute to the character of the building which is an exact replica of the adjacent property which is no.6 Bowden Close.
5. The street scene of this section of Bowden Close incorporates different building designs. However, its distinctive character is derived from symmetrically paired detached properties (no.2 and no.4, no.1 and no.3, no.5 and no.7 and no.6 and no.8). These create an appearance of a neat and unified street scene with

a strongly defined building line where all of the dwellings are set back behind modest, well maintained, front gardens.

6. The proposed single storey extension to front of house would protrude prominently at the front of the property and would also introduce a pitched roof element at ground floor level. This will alter the vertical perception of the property façade as it would introduce a horizontal element at ground floor level. The relationship between the single storey extension to front of house and the host property would appear awkward when viewed from the street. The introduction of this incongruous single storey extension to the front of the house into the otherwise symmetrical pair of properties would result in an alien form of development which would appear at odds with the strongly established building line to the front of the street. The contribution that the host property and adjacent dwelling at no.6 make to the appearance of the street scene would be diminished as a result.
7. The appellant argues there is a similar development in the locality. They refer to an approved scheme at 4 Thrunton Walk. The information provided does not give a clear picture of the circumstances of this development and whether it is an extension to the front or indeed part of the original design. As I observed on my visit to the site and surroundings, the property at 4 Thrunton Walk has its own distinctive design which is not mirrored by any property on Thrunton Walk, which is in contrast with the circumstances considered for the appeal property. It is also in a different part of the Great Park Area development scheme. Nevertheless, it is necessary to consider the individual merits of the appeal proposal before me. In that context, the scheme would have a visually harmful effect on the residential quality of the street given the overall design, siting of the extension and its specific context.
8. I find that the development would significantly harm the visual appearance of the host dwelling and is inconsistent with the established character of the area. Accordingly, there is conflict with the aims and objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework, Policies EN1.1 of Newcastle upon Tyne's Unitary Development Plan and Policy CS15 of the Core Strategy and Urban Core Plan for Gateshead and Newcastle upon Tyne 2010 – 2030 (2015) which amongst other things seek to ensure that new developments meet high standards of design and are well related to their site and surroundings by responding positively to local distinctiveness and character.

Conclusion and Recommendation

9. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

Ifeanyi Chukwujekwu

APPEALS PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

10. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report, and on that basis, I agree that the appeal should be dismissed.

Chris Preston

INSPECTOR