



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 September 2020

by William Walton BA MSc Dip Env Law LLM CPE BVC MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28th September 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/W4515/D/20/3253695

10 Purbeck Road, Longbenton NE12 8NE

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant full planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Dean Nelson against the decision of North Tyneside Council.
 - The application Ref 20/00442/FULH, dated 26 March 2020, was refused by notice dated 2 June 2020.
 - The development proposed is a two-storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.
3. The appeal site is located within a housing estate to the west of the A188 in Longbenton, North Tyneside. The appeal property is a traditional red brick semi-detached dwelling located on the corner of Purbeck Road and Doultong Close. The property sits within a large plot and is largely screened by a tall, mature hedge along the boundary with Purbeck Road and Doultong Close.
4. The appeal proposal constitutes a 2-storey side extension which would include 2 additional bedrooms and a shower / toilet at first floor level and a family room and store at ground floor level. It would include a ramp to allow a wheelchair-bound occupant to access the external patio area.
5. The surrounding area comprises predominantly 2-storey houses arranged in quite long terraced blocks on long roads running in parallel with one another and some in shorter blocks on shorter closes. Typically, the blocks are arranged to leave quite a large garden plot on each of the corners.
6. According to the Appellant's plans the proposed development would extend just under 6.5 metres from the side of the existing dwelling towards the boundary such that the gable would almost be aligned with the front elevation of 2 Doultong Close. It would run flush with the front and rear elevations of the host dwelling. According to the Council the development proposal would extend the property by around 65% of its original size.
7. This would constitute a very substantial extension. Furthermore, the proposal does not include any step-back or step-down. However, neither its size nor its design as regards its profile would significantly detract from the character and

appearance of the host building or the surrounding area since it would sit on a large, well screened corner plot preventing any possibility of a terraced effect and affording it a large degree of seclusion.

8. The left-hand side of the rear elevation of the proposed development would incorporate a small and an ordinary sized window adjacent to one another on the first floor and a door opening on the ground floor. The right-hand side of the rear elevation, however, would contain no openings. Consequently, the large expanse of bare, red brick wall would look very stark when viewed from along Doultong Close. Whilst the ground floor of the proposed extension would be largely hidden from view by a garage within the grounds of 2 Doultong Close and a solid wooden boundary fence, the first-floor elevation would be clearly visible. This large expanse of blank wall would be incongruous and therefore harmful to the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area.
9. Therefore, because of the blank, rear facing elevation the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area. Consequently, the proposal would, in that regard, fail to accord with Policy DM6.2 of the North Tyneside Local Plan 2017 (LP) which advises that residential extensions should complement the form and the character of the existing building.
10. It would also conflict with the advice set out in the Council's Design Quality: Supplementary Planning Document 2018 (SPG) that side extensions should be subordinate in scale. However, since Policy DM6.2(b) of the LP requires proposals to be assessed in relation to their effect on the street scene, which in this instance is limited, the advice in the SPG concerning the desire for subordinate side extensions should be given reduced weight.

Other Matters

11. The Appellant requires additional and improved living accommodation for himself and his family. Moving home to a larger property is financially unrealistic. He sustained life threatening injuries when working for the fire brigade leaving him wheelchair-bound and having had to take early retirement. These are considerations that I have given significant weight to. However, the conflict with the Development Plan is so fundamental that it outweighs these considerations.

Conclusion

12. The appeal should be dismissed.

William Walton

INSPECTOR