



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 9 March 2021 S Witherley CIHCM MRTPI

Decision by Andrew Owen BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 April 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/M4510/D/20/3264458

14 Dobson Crescent, Newcastle Upon Tyne NE6 1TT

- 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 Aaron Smith against the decision of Newcastle Upon Tyne City Council.
 - The application Ref 2020/1244/01/DET, dated 24 August 2020, was refused by notice dated 30 November 2020.
 - The development proposed was originally described as rear extension with internal alterations and external works to front of property.
-

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.

Procedural matter

3. The description of the development in the banner header above was taken from the application form. During the course of the application process the scheme was amended. In the Council's decision notice and the appellant's appeal form the development is described as erection of single storey extension to the rear. This accurately describes the development now proposed and the appeal has 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 for the Recommendation

5. No. 14 is a three-storey terrace located in Saint Peters Basin, a relatively modern quayside redevelopment which contains a mix of residential properties of various types and styles.
6. It sits within a short block of five terraced properties with similar blocks forming Dobson Crescent. The rear elevations appear relatively unaltered with the exception of a rear extension on a property at the end of the street. The generally unaltered rear facades, alongside the regular repeating window openings and boundary treatments result in a pleasant and continuous rhythm within both the short terrace block and the wider street.

7. The proposed rear extension with mono pitched roof would sit across the width of the ground floor rear elevation. Its presence in terms of scale and form would break up the continuous and unaltered rhythm that currently exists within the short terrace. Moreover, the proposal would introduce a juxtaposed addition to the rear elevation which, despite having the windows aligned with the upper floors, would break up the existing building lines of the uniformed rear elevation, detracting from the overall character and appearance of properties in the short terrace block and wider street scape.
8. The proposal would therefore have a detrimental effect on the character and appearance of the appeal property and the surrounding area. 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) Policy DM20 which seek to secure high quality design that responds positively to the character and local distinctiveness of an area. Whilst the Council have stated the proposal would not be in accordance with Policy DM23 this policy relates to residential amenity. No issues have been raised in that regard therefore the policy is not considered relevant in the determination of this appeal.

Other Matters

9. Reference has been made to other developments in Dobson Crescent, particularly development of existing integral garages located on the front elevations. No details regarding these developments have been submitted. In any event, each application is to be determined on its own individual merits and I see no comparison between a rear extension as proposed and that of a converted garage upon the front facade. In addition, whilst the appellant states the neighbouring residents support the proposal, no evidence of this has been submitted. Nevertheless, this would not render the proposal more acceptable in planning terms.

Conclusion and Recommendation

10. 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

APPLEAS PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

Andrew Owen

INSPECTOR