



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 December 2021

by Katherine Robbie BA (Hons) DipTP MTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 05 January 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/M4510/D/21/3282363

3 Princes Meadow, Gosforth, Newcastle Upon Tyne NE3 4RZ

- 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 Mrs Emma Mace against the decision of Newcastle Upon Tyne City Council.
 - The application Ref 2021/1091/01/DET, dated 20 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 6 August 2021.
 - The development proposed is 'part single storey part two storey rear extension including loft conversion and storage lean to shed to the side'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the appeal property and the surrounding area including the St Nicholas Hospital Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a modern two-storey detached house located within an attractive cul-de-sac containing similar two-storey houses. The houses within the cul-de-sac and Princes Meadow generally are not of a single uniform design. There is, however, a consistent approach in terms of scale and design detailing leading to a sense of uniformity and is particularly noticeable with regard to the depth of the houses.
4. The appeal property backs onto an area of open space at the entrance to the estate on Emblehope Drive. The open space contains a number of trees and shrubs which creates a pleasingly sylvan setting and provides some screening of the rear of the row of houses containing the appeal property. The houses are, however, visible beyond the trees. During the summer months the trees may provide more screening than when I visited the site, nevertheless, for a good proportion of the year the rear of the appeal site will be visible from the Drive.
5. The Council's decision notice refers only to the two-storey rear extension and roof extension and not to the single storey extensions to the rear and side. However, as these are an integral part of the proposal and are not able to be split from the two-storey and roof extension elements, I must consider the proposal as a whole.

6. The roof ridge of the appeal property is broadly in line with those of 1 and 2 Princes Meadow and is stepped down from the ridge line of 4 Princes Meadow due to the gently rising topography of the street. The proposal would raise the ridge of the roof by just under a metre to accommodate a loft extension and would result in a ridge height more in line with that of No 4. The two-storey rear element would extend the full width of the house with a gabled roof which would project from the extended roof structure. The resulting extension would add significant bulk to the rear of the house which would appear prominent and at odds with the other houses on the street especially when viewed from the rear and from the east where the side elevation would be visible from the street. The extension would not be subservient to the scale and design of the original house and would subsume the original rear elevation of the house. Although the extension would be constructed in matching materials, this would not mitigate the incongruous and inappropriate scale of the extension or overcome the harm that I have identified.
7. Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 places a statutory duty to have special regard to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the CA. In considering the effect of the proposal on the CA's setting the impact must be weighed against the harm it would have on the heritage asset.
8. The significance of the CA is derived from the setting and former grounds of the grade II listed hospital buildings which have been converted into residential accommodation. The Princes Meadows development was built after the area was designated as a CA and I observed that these houses are a generally positive addition to the area. The area is included in the CA due to its setting within the hospital grounds.
9. The appeal proposal would introduce a form of development which is dominant and incongruous. The proposal fails to respect the scale and character of the host property which is located at a prominent position at the entrance to the CA and therefore fails to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA. The harm to the character and appearance of the CA would be less than substantial, however.
10. Paragraph 202 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that where the harm is less than substantial, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. The benefit in this instance would be private in providing additional accommodation for the benefit of the appellant and her family. Therefore, there are no public benefits that would outweigh the harm derived from the proposed extension.
11. I find therefore that the proposed extension would adversely affect the character and appearance of the appeal property and would fail to enhance or preserve the character or appearance of the CA. As such the proposal would be contrary to the Policies DM15, DM20 and DM23 of the Newcastle upon Tyne Development and Allocations Plan (2020) which together seek to ensure high quality design and protect heritage assets. It would also fail to comply with Policy CS15 of the Core Strategy and Urban Core Plan for Gateshead and Newcastle upon Tyne (2015), which seeks to ensure that development delivers quality and sustainable design, and the consideration and enhancement of the historic environment. The proposal would also fail to comply with the general advice provided in the Householder Design Guide 'Extending your Home'

(2011) which indicates that extensions should be well designed, and clearly visually and physically subordinate to the original building.

Other Matters

12. I have noted the appellant's desire to provide additional living space for her family and her wish to remain in the area, but this does not justify the harm I have found in this case.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, having considered the development plan as a whole and all relevant material considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Katherine Robbie

INSPECTOR