

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/H4505/D/20/3262586

48 St Austell Gardens, Chowdene Gateshead, NE9 6XF

- 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 Joci Sehiti against the decision of Gateshead Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref DC/20/00693/HHA, dated 5 August 2020, was refused by notice dated 1 October 2020.
 - The description of the development proposed on the application form is proposed extension at first floor.
-

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

Preliminary Matters

3. The description used in the banner header above was taken from the application form. However, the description in the Council's decision notice and the appellant's appeal form is *proposed construction of first floor extensions and balcony to west elevation*. That is a more accurate description of the proposal and I have proceeded on that basis.

Main Issue

4. The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the appeal property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

5. No. 48 is an extended two-storey detached dwelling with a traditional pitched roof with gable ends. It is located on a residential estate built in an elevated location overlooking the Team Valley.
 6. No. 48 along with the neighbouring properties, which are predominately semi-detached, are of a similar style with regular pitched roofs with gable ends. At ground floor there is a mix of projecting garages and porches along the street scape which is contrasted by the clear and defined building line at first floor.
-

7. Whilst the style and pitched roof of No. 48 appears to be the predominate style throughout the area, I observed a variation in the roof form of another house type where the front facing mono pitched roof was split and stepped down. This style of house does not appear as regularly throughout the estate and appears to take advantage of the steep location with the roof stepped to take account of the undulating site topography. Notwithstanding that design variation, there is a strong consistency in the design of roofline of the dwellings on St Austell Gardens. That consistency represents an attractive design feature of itself but the way in which the gable roofs gradually step up in height to take account of the incline of the road, is a distinctive feature of the immediate vicinity.
8. The proposal would see the introduction of two prominent gables at first floor with a balcony set between these overlooking the Team Valley. As No. 48 is the end property within this section of street the proposed alterations would be particularly prominent. The removal of the regular and strong building line at first floor which, as noted is a predominate feature in this part of the street, would be replaced by the introduction of the alien and juxtaposed gable facade. Moreover, whilst the introduction of a first-floor balcony upon the front façade would not impact on any of the neighbouring living conditions, the introduction of a balcony upon this prominent front façade, together with the proposed dual fronted gables, would introduce features which are uncharacteristic of the area and would not be coherent with the original design of No. 48, or the wider street scape generally.
9. As such the proposal would neither respect or enhance the existing characteristics of the street scene as required by the Councils Household Alterations and Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). Whilst the appellant has suggested the design of the two gables are common in this area, no details or examples of these other developments have been submitted and, as described above, I found a great deal of consistency in the roof design at first floor level. Consequently, reference to other examples has not led me to change my recommendation.
10. I find that the proposal would have a visually harmful effect upon the character and appearance of the appeal property and the surrounding area. Accordingly, it would not comply with Policy CS15 of the Core Strategy and Urban Core Plan for Gateshead and Newcastle upon Tyne (2015) and saved Policy ENV3 of the Gateshead Unitary Development Plan (2010), guidance within the SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework in so far as they seek, amongst other things, development of high quality design that responds positively to local distinctiveness and character.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above it is recommended that the appeal should be dismissed.

S Witherley

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspectors Decision

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

Chris Preston

INSPECTOR