



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 June 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: 26 June 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/M4510/D/20/3246698

11 Flexbury Gardens, Denton, Newcastle Upon Tyne NE15 7SH

- 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 Alec Young against the decision of Newcastle City Council.
 - The application Ref 2019/1471/01/DET, dated 30 September 2019, was refused by notice dated 16 January 2020.
 - The development proposed is first floor extension and porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for construction of a first-floor extension and porch at 11 Flexbury Gardens, Denton, Newcastle Upon Tyne NE15 7SH in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2019/1471/01/DET, dated 30 September 2019, 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. 631-01 (Survey of Existing), Drawing No. 631-02 Revision C (Scheme Proposals), Drawing No. 631-03 (Site/Roof Plan) and Location Plan.
 - 3) The external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be constructed in the materials detailed on the application form.

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.

Procedural Matters

3. The Council finds the porch element of the proposal to be acceptable. I find no reason to disagree given its limited scale and the presence of other similar structures within the local area.

Main Issue

4. The effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. No.11 is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling located on Flexbury Gardens in the Denton area of Newcastle upon Tyne. The surrounding area is residential, and the street scene is characterised by a mix of two-storey paired semi-detached dwellings and detached dwellings. A number of the properties on the street have been extended at the side up to first floor level, incorporating a flat roof which is contrary to guidance contained in Newcastle City Council's Development Management Extending Your Home – A Design Guide Series (Updated 2011)¹. Both the adjoining no.13 and neighbouring no.15 have been extended at first floor with flat roofs and the extension at no.17 appears to be flush at the roof ridge as well as the front wall with the host property.
6. Those previous extensions have created a continuous building frontage or "terracing effect" in the run of properties from No. 11 to No. 17. Similarly, on the opposite side of the street no. 8 has a first-floor extension which is flush at the roof ridge as well as the front wall with the host property. The neighbouring detached dwelling which is no.10 has also been extended at first floor above the garage, with a flat roof extending to meet the extension at no.8 without any gap between the properties. Thus, there is no distinct character on the street and any symmetry between semi-detached properties have long been diminished by the variety in design of extensions, most of which do not adhere to design guidance.
7. The introduction of a first-floor extension over the garage at no.11 would not be an incongruous addition to the host property. This is because as already established in paragraph 5 above, the host property along with the adjoining and neighbouring properties already have an appearance of a continuous building frontage and the symmetry of the pair of semi-detached properties already appears unbalanced. Also, the extension would be stepped down from the ridge and set back from the front wall of the host property. Thus, it would have some degree of subservience. As such, the proposed first floor extension would not appear visually intrusive or unacceptably prominent on the street scene.
8. My attention has been drawn to the proposed width of the extension which would not be subservient to the host property. However, the garage already extends to this width and the Extension Guide only mentions width with regards to retaining the gap between properties where the dwellings were originally laid out as semi-detached or detached properties to prevent a terracing effect. Much of this has already been eroded on the street. Nevertheless, there would still be a gap between the wall of neighbouring no.9 and the wall of the extension which provides a visual break the two properties. Should the occupants of no.9 choose to extend, it is more likely to be a first-floor extension over the garage which is on the other side of the property.
9. The proposed extension would therefore not be incongruous with the character of the surrounding area and having regard to the specific circumstances of the

¹ See Chapter 3: Side Extensions, paragraph 3. Roof Shape

proposal and its relationship with neighbouring properties, I am satisfied that the modest set back and roof step down, and the relationship between the ground floor garage and proposed first floor element would result in a well-balanced extension that would not be out of scale or proportion with the existing property.

10. I find that proposal would not have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the host dwelling or the street scene and find no conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and policies H2 and EN1.1 of the Unitary Development Plan, Policy CS15 of the Core Strategy and Urban Core Plan for Gateshead and Newcastle upon Tyne 2010-2030 (2015) and Policies DM20 and DM23 of the Development and Allocations Plan for Newcastle Upon Tyne 2015-2030 Submission Plan which seek amongst other things to ensure that new development responds positively to local distinctiveness and character having regard to such factors as scale, massing, height, materials, density, legibility, views and vistas.

Conditions

11. In addition to the standard time limit condition a condition is necessary to ensure that the proposed development is carried out in accordance with approved plans, in the interests of clarity. It is also necessary to attach a condition to ensure that the materials used are in accordance with the details on the application form in order to ensure a satisfactory appearance.

Conclusion and Recommendation

12. For the reasons given above and having had regard to evidence before me, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed.

Ifeanyi Chukwujekwu

APPEALS PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

13. 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 allowed.

Chris Preston

INSPECTOR