



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 25 May 2021 by S Witherley CIHCM MRTPI

Decision by Chris Preston BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 June 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/M4510/D/21/3271255

22 Adderstone Crescent, Jesmond, Newcastle Upon Tyne NE2 2HH

- 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 D Dayalopa against the decision of Newcastle Upon Tyne City Council.
 - The application Ref 2020/1381/01/DET, dated 6 August 2020, was refused by notice dated 2 March 2021.
 - The development proposed is proposed two storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a proposed two storey side extension at 22 Adderstone Crescent, Jesmond, Newcastle Upon Tyne, NE2 2HH in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2020/1381/01/DET, dated 16 September 2020 and the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans PO-20-100 Rev P4.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

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 proposal on the character and appearance of the area, including whether the proposed development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Jesmond Dene Conservation Area (CA) in which it is located.

Reasons

4. No. 22 is a relatively modern detached two storey property located towards the northern tip of Adderston Crescent. It appears as one of three modern infill properties in a street which also contains large Victorian and Edwardian detached and semi-detached villa type properties.

5. The neighbouring property to the south, No. 24, is a large detached villa set in equally substantial grounds. It has a number of attractive features including a distinct oriel window located on the flank wall which is set back from the shared boundary with No. 22. Opposite the appeal site is a row of densely arranged blocks of flats which feature flat roofs and rows of single storey garages. The characteristics of this part of the street therefore features a greater number of modern infill and higher density housing than other parts. This results in variation between plot sizes, layout, and differences in the gaps between properties.
6. The site sits within the CA with its significance according to the Jesmond Dene Conservation Area Character Statement (CACS) deriving from the mix of low-density large mid Victorian and Edwardian villas. These provide evidence of the expansion of Newcastle beyond its historic central core in the late 19th Century. It also demonstrates the house types, design and layout of the time and this is a key defining characteristic of the CA taken as a whole. The CACS recognises the impact that later infill developments have on the CA and that not all of these appear to make a positive contribution to the significance of the CA. Given that the appeal property appears so different to the rest of the area, it is not therefore considered that it makes a large contribution of the significance of this part of the CA or the CA as a whole.
7. The proposal would extend above the existing ground floor side addition up to the original ridge height of No. 22. As it would not extend beyond the existing ground floor additions it would avoid appearing bulky or incongruous within the streetscape.
8. Whilst it would bring the built form at first floor nearer to the shared boundary with No. 24, given the separation distance of these properties a gap would be maintained, albeit smaller than the existing. This would result in a change to the existing situation but sufficient space would remain to maintain the sense of separation and grandeur of the adjacent dwelling and the change would not amount to harm to the character and appearance of the area or the CA taken as a whole. Moreover, given the setback position of No. 22, along with its proposed pitched roof form, the potential for the proposal to create a terracing effect with this neighbouring property is unlikely. Particularly when considering the existing features of No. 24 with its hipped roof profile combined with the separation distance of its flank wall to the shared boundary. The proposal therefore accords with the Development Management, *Extending Your Home, A Design Series*, (2011) which seeks side extensions to remain subordinate to the original dwelling and in keeping with the general street scene.
9. Whilst the proposal would result in the flank wall of No. 22 being brought closer to the shared boundary with the older neighbouring building, No. 24, the key architectural features of that building would still remain visible, including the side facing oriel window and the proposal would not prevent the understanding and appreciation of this neighbouring building, nor would it diminish the contribution it makes to the significance of the CA.
10. The proposal, therefore, would not harm the character and appearance of the area, and as such would preserve the significance of the CA, as it relates to the appeal site, and as a whole. It therefore accords with Policy CS15 of the Gateshead and Newcastle upon Tyne Core Strategy and Urban Core Plan Development 2010 – 2030 (2015) (CUSP) and Policies DM15, DM20 and DM23

of the Development and Allocations Plan (2020) (DAP), which seek to secure high quality design that responds positively to local distinctiveness and which preserve the character of the CA. As the significance of the CA would not be harmed, the development would also avoid conflict with the National Planning Policy Frameworks historic environment conservation requirements.

Other Matters

11. Representations were received from neighbours who raised a number of objections. Matters relating to character and appearance have been addressed above. Matters relating to the impact the proposal would have on the living conditions of the occupiers of No. 24 were considered by the Council who raised no issues in this regard. Having viewed the proposal on site and assessed the relationship between the two properties I have no reason to consider otherwise. The additional rear window would be small and would serve an en-suite bathroom which is likely to be used fleetingly. As such, it would not result in any notable increase in overlooking. It is also likely that the occupants would obscure or screen the window when using the bathroom to maintain their own privacy. Accordingly, a planning condition to secure details of the glazing is unnecessary.

Conditions

12. I have imposed the standard time limit condition and have specified the approved plans as this provides certainty. A condition is necessary for the materials to match those that are used in the existing property to maintain the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion and Recommendation

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

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 allowed.

Chris Preston

INSPECTOR