
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 January 2022

by D Hartley BA (Hons) MTP MBA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 31 January 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/W4515/D/21/3286735
59 Forest Avenue, Forest Hall NE12 9AH

- 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 Sophie Dicocco against the decision of North Tyneside Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/00872/FULH, dated 23 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 13 May 2021.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side extension with single storey rear extension to replace existing garage on semi-detached dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal property is an end of terraced brick dwelling with a hipped roof. It falls within a residential area comprising a mixture of 1930s and 1970s dwellings. The evidence is that planning permission has recently been approved for the removal of the single storey side garage and the erection of a two storey side extension with an asymmetrical pitched roof¹. The only difference between that approval, which is a material planning consideration to which I afford significant weight, and the subject appeal proposal relates to the omission of a roof connecting the main hipped roof of the appeal dwelling and the asymmetrical roof of the two storey extension. In addition, in respect of the appeal proposal it is proposed to include render for the whole of the front elevation which compares to the use of brick and timber cladding to the approved ground floor Forest Avenue elevation.
4. The proposed extension would be contemporary in terms of its design. While a contemporary approach to the extension of the appeal dwelling has already been approved, that does not mean that an extension should pay little regard to the character and appearance of the host property, or indeed the wider terrace. The omission of the connecting roof has the effect of creating an extension that appears visually disjointed from the host dwelling and terrace and owing to its materials and uncharacteristic asymmetrical roof shape, it

¹ Planning permission 21/00149/FULH

would appear incongruous and out of place in this urban setting. The inclusion of a connecting roof would ensure that the extension appeared visually connected to the host property and wider terrace and with a resultant subservient roof that was experienced by passers-by as appearing 'hipped' and suitably reflecting the appearance of the hipped roof of the main dwelling when viewed from Westcroft Road and Forest Avenue.

5. In the absence of a connecting roof, the proposed extension would appear as standalone and out of keeping contemporary structure that pays very little regard to the form and appearance of the host property and wider terrace. This identified harm would be compounded in so far that the use of increased render, at the expense of brick, would seek to emphasise that the proposal pays little attention to its initial design context. In other words, in the absence of a connecting roof and the use of at least some brick for the elevations, the proposal would fail to accord with policy DM6.1 of the North Tyneside Local Plan 2017 (LP) which states that extensions should '*complement the form and character of the original building*'.
6. For the above reasons, I therefore conclude that the proposal would represent poor design. It would fail to accord with the design, character and appearance requirements of policies S1.4, DM6.1 and DM6.2 of the LP and chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2021. In reaching this conclusion, I have taken into account the appellant's comment that the inclusion of a connecting roof would result in the use of more energy and materials and hence would increase the carbon footprint of the proposal. However, this is not a matter which would obviate the need to achieve good design.

Conclusion

7. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the development would not accord with the development plan for the area taken as a whole and there are no material considerations that indicate the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, the appeal should be dismissed.

D Hartley

INSPECTOR