



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 October 2020

by J Hunter BA (Hons) Msc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/M4510/D/20/3256642

4 Aberford Close, North Walbottle, Newcastle Upon Tyne NE5 1PX

- 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 Omran Awan against the decision of Newcastle-upon-Tyne City Council.
 - The application Ref 2020/0604/01/DET, dated 7 May 2020, was refused by notice dated 1 July 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as residential extension scheme comprising new first floor extension over existing twin garage, new front porch with canopy, and removal of gable feature (free go resubmission, as originally made, of 'amended plans' approval 2020/0350/01/DET).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. Aberford Close is a residential street characterised by large detached properties on wide plots. There is a sense of uniformity provided by a limited palette of materials and the open aspect to the front gardens and driveways. One of the most striking characteristics of the area is the considerable variation in the individual design of the house types, of which, many have been extended.
4. The proposed first floor extension would introduce a projecting gable feature that would represent around one third of the total width of the dwelling. It would be at the same ridge height as the main dwelling and in addition, it would be set forward from the principal elevation by around 2 metres. Having regard to these elements, together with the significant width of the proposed extension, it would not appear as a subservient addition to the dwelling. This would be in direct conflict with the requirements of the Newcastle City Council Extending Your Home- Supplementary Planning Guidance 2011 (SPG).
5. Similarly, the proposed porch, which would project 2.5 metres from the principal elevation and forward of the established building line, would by virtue of its overall scale, appear as an incongruous, bulky addition that would be at odds with the proportions of the host dwelling. It would appear visually

conspicuous due to its prominent position close to the street entrance thus causing harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

6. There are, in the immediate vicinity, a number of other houses with forward projecting gables and larger style front porches however, none are of the scale proposed by this appeal. I accept the extensions would be constructed in matching materials and the overall design approach would be in keeping with the host dwelling and the locality. They would nonetheless result in dominant features that would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the wider street scene.
7. I note that the appeal proposes other more minor alterations including the installation of a Juliette balcony to the rear and the removal of a small gable feature on the front elevation. The Council do not raise any concerns in relation to the balcony and I have no reason to disagree with their conclusions.
8. The proposed removal of the gable feature would result in a level eaves line that would not be out of keeping with the surrounding area, although I accept that it would introduce a small variation between the host property and its matching house type at no. 6 Aberford Close. Nevertheless, in the context that there are a wide variety of house types in the vicinity, the removal of this small feature would not be to the detriment of the appeal dwelling nor would it cause harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
9. Notwithstanding the above, the proposal would be contrary to the SPG because it would be insufficiently subservient to the main dwelling. In addition, I have identified harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area as a result of the scale and bulk of the proposed extensions. In this regard, the proposal would fail to accord with the design and character and appearance requirements of Policy CS15 of the Core Strategy and Urban Core Plan for Gateshead and Newcastle 2015.

Conclusion

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

J Hunter

INSPECTOR