



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 1 November 2021

by A Caines BSc (Hons) MSc TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24th November 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/M4510/W/21/3283453

8 Polwarth Crescent, Brunton Park, Newcastle Upon Tyne NE3 2EE

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mrs Kate Blyth against Newcastle City Council.
 - The application Ref 2021/1309/01/DET, is dated 16 February 2021.
 - The development proposed is two-storey side extension, single-storey front extension, single-storey rear extension, and demolition of existing garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed and planning permission is refused.

Procedural Matters

2. The appeal relates to a planning application that was not determined by the Council within the prescribed period. Since the appeal was submitted the Council has indicated that it would have refused the application for a single reason relating to the effect on the character and appearance of the dwelling and surrounding area.
3. I have taken the description of the development from the appeal form as it is more comprehensive than that given on the planning application form.

Main Issue

4. From the evidence before me as well as my site visit, I consider that the main issue in this appeal is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is one half of a pair of semi-detached houses located at the corner of Polwarth Crescent and Polwarth Place. The evidence before me indicates that the appeal property has an extant planning permission¹ for a two-storey side extension, front porch, single-storey rear extension and boundary fencing (the approved scheme). The fencing has already been erected and I have no reason to believe the approved scheme would not be carried out in full in the event that this appeal did not succeed. Hence, this represents a 'fallback' position to which I have had regard.
6. A significant change from the approved scheme is the addition of a first floor bay window on the front elevation of the proposed two-storey side extension. The front elevation of the pair of houses currently contains a well-balanced

¹ LPA ref: 2021/0358/01/DET

arrangement of central two-storey bays with a smaller bay window above the front doors. The proposed bay window would mirror the size and design of the existing bay window alongside it. Nonetheless, in doing so it would disrupt the distinctive window hierarchy and balance of fenestration on the front elevation of the semi-detached pairing. It would also reduce the perception of subservience in the side extension. Together, this would unacceptably harm the appearance of the host dwelling and its surroundings.

7. I acknowledge that a number of properties within the surrounding streets have been similarly altered with a bay window on the side extension. However, I do not know the circumstances behind them. For the same reasons as above, they are not positive features, and are therefore not a precedent that should be followed or reinforced. Furthermore, whilst each proposal should be assessed on its individual merits, Polwarth Crescent and the surrounding streets are characterised by properties of the same type where there remains many opportunities to develop in a similar manner. Thus, if I were to allow the appeal it would, in my view, make it more difficult to resist similar proposals, which would cumulatively erode the character of the area over time.
8. In terms of the two-storey side extension, I am advised that the proposed extension would be approximately 30cm wider at the front, and with a slightly reduced set-back of 25cm compared to 30cm as approved. Given the spacious side garden and corner position of the property, I am content that these minor changes would not be significantly more harmful in comparison to the approved scheme. I have noted the apparent inconsistency in the ridge height shown on the proposed elevations, but as I have already found harm for other reasons, it has not been necessary to seek further clarification on this matter as it would not alter the appeal outcome.
9. Apart from a minor alteration to the roof form and rooflights in the rear extension, the front and rear single-storey extensions are similar to what has previously been approved. The Council has indicated that it does not raise any objection to these elements, and I have no reason to reach alternative conclusions regarding these separate aspects of the scheme.
10. Overall, whilst there are some aspects of the scheme which are acceptable, my findings in relation to the front bay window means that the development taken as a whole would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area. This is contrary to the broad design requirements of Policy C15 of the Core Strategy and Urban Core Plan for Gateshead and Newcastle upon Tyne (2015); Policies DM20 and DM23 of Newcastle's Development and Allocations Plan (2020); and the guidance contained within the Council's 'Extending Your Home' Design Guide.

Conclusion

11. Given the above, the proposal would not accord with the development plan taken as a whole and there are no considerations that outweigh this finding. Accordingly, the appeal should be dismissed.

A Caines

INSPECTOR