



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 September 2020

by J Hunter BA (Hons) Msc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16th October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/M4510/D/20/3254492

16, Arden Avenue, Brunton Park, Newcastle Upon Tyne NE3 5TS

- 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 Grieve against the decision of Newcastle-upon-Tyne City Council.
 - The application Ref 2019/1383/01/DET, dated 14 October 2019, was refused by notice dated 10 June 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as two storey extension to form utility, store and WC at ground floor level with bedroom and en-suite at first floor level.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. Since the determination of the application by the Council, the saved policies of the Newcastle upon Tyne Unitary Development Plan 1998 have been replaced by those of the Development and Allocations Plan 2015-2030 (DAP), adopted 24 June 2020. The appellants have had the opportunity to comment on the policies during the course of the appeal process so have not been prejudiced.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site comprises a semi-detached dormer bungalow with a single storey garage attached to the rear corner of the property and positioned perpendicular to the main dwelling. The property stands on a prominent corner site at the junction of Grenville Drive with Arden Avenue.
5. The surrounding area is characterised by properties of subtly different designs, many of which have been altered and extended. A relatively palette of materials, scale and proportions of the houses give the location a relatively uniform appearance.
6. The appeal proposal would add a first floor extension above the existing single storey garage. Due to the position of the garage towards the rear of the site, the extension would be set back from the principal elevation of the appeal property but in line with the established building line along Arden Avenue.

7. The ridge height would line through with the main house and the extension would be almost as wide and the principal elevation, for these reasons it would fail to appear subservient to the host dwelling. I consider that this dominance would be further exacerbated by the choice of finishing materials and fenestration details which would not match the appeal dwelling which is finished in red brick with a subtle accent of white render on the gable end.
8. Accordingly, the development would result in a dominant and incongruous addition that would fail to respect the design characteristics of its host and neighbouring properties and would be not be appropriately subservient to the appeal property. Moreover, the scale and bulk of the extension and its position in relation to the adjacent property at no 14 Arden Avenue would significantly reduce the element of spacing between buildings at this corner. The resultant built form would also be at odds with that which exists at the south west corner of the perimeter block at the junction of Arden Avenue and Greenfield Road and thus would not respect the urban grain of the area.
9. Overall, for the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal proposal would have a harmful effect upon the character or appearance of the area and would not accord with the design and character and appearance requirements of Policy DM20 of the Newcastle City Council- Development and Allocations Plan 2020 (DAP), Policy CS15 of the Core Strategy and Urban Core Plan for Gateshead and Newcastle Upon Tyne 2015 (CS) or the Householder Design Guide 2011.

Other Matters

10. The appellants have raised a number of points in relation to the cost implication and construction difficulties associated with alternative design proposals. My attention was also drawn to the neighbouring two storey extension at no. 14 Arden Avenue and its perceived impact on the appeal property. Nonetheless, these matters do not outweigh the harm that I have found in relation to the main issue.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons set out above and taking into account all other matters raised, I conclude the appeal should be dismissed.

J Hunter

INSPECTOR