

Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 1 December 2020 by S Witherley CIHCM MRTPI

Decision by Chris Preston BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 December 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/M4510/D/20/3262228

23 Grove Park Crescent, Gosforth, NEWCASTLE UPON TYNE, NE3 1BP

- 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 Harper against the decision of Newcastle Upon Tyne City Council.
 - The application Ref 2020/0926/01/DET, dated 3 July 2020, was refused by notice dated 6 October 2020.
 - The development proposed on the application form is enclosing existing front and back covered porch with glass panels.
-

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 development on the character and appearance of the host property and whether the proposed development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Gosforth Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

4. No. 23 is a three-storey property located in a crescent shaped terrace on the north east edge of the CA. The CA Management Plan Supplementary Planning Document (CAMSPD) identifies that the CA, in so far as it relates to this appeal, derives its significance from the social history that underpins the former Procter and Gamble site along with the surrounding residential suburb which contains a number of housing types of architectural interest including Victorian, Queen Anne Revival and Edwardian properties.
5. The property is relatively modern and falls within the redevelopment of the former Procter and Gamble site. Architecturally the building has a pleasant repeating rhythm at both the front and rear in the form of the regular repeating window openings, first floor balcony with black balustrade and distinctive supporting black pillars at ground level.

6. At the front of the property there are spaces for off street parking which are separated by brick-built storage areas for refuse bins. The rear elevations open out onto an enclosed communal green space.
7. The proposal seeks to enclose the ground floor area at both the front and rear with a heavily glazed unit which would sit between the supporting pillars at ground floor and directly below the first-floor balcony. Its design, whilst not finely detailed on the drawings, shows a number of glazed panels set within vertical aluminium panels.
8. The front and rear elevations of No. 23 can be seen from various viewpoints within the public realm. Given the design of the proposal, the use of materials and vertical emphasis of the aluminium panels, the symmetry and openness that currently exists between the properties would be diminished. Moreover, the proposal would introduce an alien and juxtaposed addition at both the front and rear elevations which would break up the existing lines of the uniformed facade and the projecting balconies which would detract from the overall character and appearance of the appeal building and the surrounding CA.
9. The level of harm caused is considered less than substantial, nevertheless, this is to be given considerable importance and weight, having regard to the statutory duty to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA. This harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use. Whilst I appreciate the reasons given by the appellant for needing the enclosed area, these reasons, however, are personal to the appellant and there is little in the way of public benefit to offset the identified harm. The desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the CA is to be given considerable importance and weight, and the personal benefits purported would not justify the harm to the significance of the CA. The proposal, therefore, causes harm that is not justified or outweighed, as required by the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework).
11. I find that the development would have a detrimental effect on the character and appearance of No. 23 and fails to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA. Accordingly, the development would fail to comply with Planning for the future Core Strategy and Urban Core Plan for Gateshead and Newcastle upon Tyne 2010-30 (2015) Policy CS15 and the Development and Allocations Plan 2015 – 2030 (2020) Policies DM15, DM20 and DM23 which seek to secure high quality design that responds positively to local distinctiveness and character and which preserve the character of the CA.

Other Matters

12. Whilst the appellant has suggested that further details regarding the proposals design, colour and material finish could be conditioned. However, the harm would arise from the impact of enclosing the space below the balcony and the effect on the pleasing rhythm of the row and that could not be overcome by conditioning the proposed materials.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, it is recommended that the appeal should be dismissed.

S Witherley

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

Chris Preston

INSPECTOR