The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 24 August 2021

by A Caines BSc(Hons) MSc TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1st September 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/M4510/D/21/3278442
1 Juniper Close, Newcastle Upon Tyne NE3 5PL

- 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 Paul Anderson against the decision of Newcastle City Council.
- The application Ref 2020/2070/01/DET, dated 21 December 2020, was refused by notice dated 1 June 2021.
- The development proposed is raising of roof ridge level, new roof over porch and garage to front.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The description of development is taken from the appeal form and decision notice as it reflects amendments that were made during the application process and which subsequently formed the basis on which the Council made its decision. I have determined the appeal on the same basis.

3. On 20 July 2021, the Government published a revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). The revised Framework does not materially alter the national policy approach in respect of the main issues raised in this appeal and therefore no parties have been prejudiced by its publication.

Main Issue

4. The new roof over the porch and garage did not feature in the Council's refusal reason and I see nothing in the Council's officer report indicating that it is opposed to this element of the appeal scheme. From the information before me I have no reason to disagree with the Council on this matter. The appellant also indicates that these works may not require planning permission. As such, my considerations shall be confined to the proposed roof alterations.

5. Therefore, the main issue is the effect of the proposed roof alterations on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

6. The appeal property is a two-storey detached house located within an attractive residential cul-de-sac containing similar two-storey houses and some bungalows. Whilst the wider surrounding area does include a variety of house types and appearance, those within Juniper Close and Beech Close are part of the same development and have their own distinctive architectural uniformity,

which contributes very positively and distinctively to the character and appearance of the local area.

7. The proposal would increase the height, roof pitch and overall size of the roof, thereby significantly altering its proportions. Despite use of matching materials, the sizeable roof and its steep pitch would be markedly at odds with the surrounding houses within Juniper Close and Beech Close, and thus would appear incongruous. Consequently, although the effect would be localised, the development would detract from the overall quality and character of its surroundings.

8. I therefore conclude that the proposed roof alterations would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the area. This is contrary to Policy C15 of the Core Strategy and Urban Core Plan for Gateshead and Newcastle upon Tyne 2010-2030 (2015), and Policies DM20 and DM23 of Newcastle's Development and Allocations Plan 2015-2030 (2020). These require, amongst other things, that development responds positively to local character and context. The proposal is also contrary to paragraph 130 of the Framework in this regard.

Other Matters

9. The appellant refers to examples of two-storey side extensions that have previously been permitted within Juniper Close, but clearly they are not comparable to the appeal scheme. My attention was also drawn to developments at Melton House and Brandling Mews. However, Melton House is a care home which sits within its own highly secluded grounds, whilst Brandling Mews is a separate higher density mews-style development with its own unique architectural character. I am therefore satisfied that the sites referred to are not sufficiently similar in context and circumstances to the appeal proposal to have any bearing on the outcome of this appeal.

10. The development would provide improved accommodation for the appellant's family, but this is not a consideration that would justify the harm that would be caused by the proposed development. I also note that there were no concerns raised by the Council with regards to neighbour impact and parking, but these are requirements of the development plan and they do not weigh in favour of the scheme.

Conclusion

11. The proposal conflicts with the development plan and Framework as a whole and there are no other considerations that outweigh this conflict.

12. Therefore, for the reasons outlined above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

A Caines

INSPECTOR