



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 14 September 2021

by J Hunter BA(Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 October 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/M4510/D/21/3281261

23 Longridge Avenue, Newcastle Upon Tyne NE7 7LB

- 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 Lee Gilbert against the decision of Newcastle Upon Tyne City Council.
 - The application Ref 2020/1880/01/DET, dated 26 November 2020, was refused by notice dated 11 June 2021.
 - The development proposed is extend house at first floor level above existing garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted to extend house at first floor level above existing garage. at 23 Longridge Avenue, Newcastle Upon Tyne NE7 7LB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2020/1880/01/DET, dated 26 November 2020, and the plans submitted with it, subject to 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: Existing and Proposed Plans and Elevations (Rev 6), Location Plan.
 - 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.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a two storey semi-detached house in a spacious corner plot. The surrounding area is characterised by similar properties with subtle differences in fenestration and rooflines but overall, the spacious layout and rhythm of development affords the location with a sense of uniformity.
4. The proposal would see the development of a first floor extension above the existing garage as well as a relatively shallow, flat roofed, single storey rear extension. The Council has not raised an objection to the single storey element of the proposal, and I have no reason to disagree with this view.

5. The design of the proposed extensions would match the detailing of the existing house. The proposed first floor extension would be set back from the principal elevation and the ridge line would be set lower than the main house. In this respect, the proposal would be subservient to the host property thus according with the key principles set out within the Council's Householder Design Guide, 'Extending Your Home' 2011.
6. The first floor extension would sit above the existing double garage and would therefore significantly increase the scale and bulk of the building, bringing the first floor element to within 2metres of the boundary with Benton Hall Walk. Given the scale of the proposal and its position closer to the highway, the proposal would be visible in views along Benton Hall Walk. Nonetheless, because there is a very similar extension directly behind the host property it would not project beyond the building line. Therefore, whilst there would be some loss of openness, as with all extensions I do not consider that this would be so harmful as to justify refusal of planning permission in this case.
7. For the reasons set out above I conclude that the proposed development would not be out of scale, or overly prominent and would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. Accordingly, I do not find conflict with the requirements of Policy CS15 of the Newcastle Gateshead Core Strategy and Policies DM20 and DM23 of the Newcastle upon Tyne Development and Allocations Plan. These policies collectively seek to ensure good quality placemaking through high quality design that protects residential amenity.

Conditions

8. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have imposed a condition requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans. This is in the interest of certainty. In order to protect the character and appearance of the area, I have also imposed a condition requiring the external materials used in the construction of the front porch to match those of the existing building.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons set out above and taking all other matters into consideration I conclude the appeal should be allowed.

J Hunter

INSPECTOR

