



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 November 2023

by K L Robbie BA (Hons) DipTP MTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 05 December 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/M4510/D/23/3329570

1 Gracefield Close, Chapel Park, Newcastle Upon Tyne NE5 1SW

- 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 & Mrs Hastie against the decision of Newcastle Upon Tyne City Council.
 - The application Ref 2022/2121/01/HOU, dated 22 December 2022, was refused by notice dated 29 August 2023.
 - The development proposed is alterations & extension to the lounge on ground floor.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for alterations & extension to the lounge on ground floor at 1 Gracefield Close, Chapel Park, Newcastle Upon Tyne NE5 1SW in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2022/2121/01/HOU, dated 22 December 2022, 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: Location Plan (unreferenced); 1007/01 plans as existing; 1007/02 plans as proposed; 1007/03 proposed site plans.
 - 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 proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a detached two storey dwelling on the corner of Gracefield Close and Granville Drive. It is located in a prominent position at the entrance to the close. The appeal property differs from many properties on the close which are semi-detached or linked by garages, numerous of which, including the appeal property have front porch extensions and garage canopies. Porches and garage canopy extensions along the close differ in scale and style.
4. The proposal involves a modestly sized extension at ground floor on the front elevation of the property which would extend the lounge forward in line with the existing porch and garage. It would match the porch in both materials and style.

5. Variations in the appearance of properties are commonplace. The design of porches, colours of hung tiles and window details within the close and on other streets nearby vary and mean that the proposal would not appear incongruous or out of place in its surroundings. Furthermore, the extension would not fundamentally alter the character or appearance of the host property.
6. The Council refers to conflict with its Householder Design Guide¹ (HDG). The extension would extend across the full width of the property. It would, however, be modest in size and would reflect the design, detailing, proportions and materials of the existing dwelling and would be in keeping with the wider street scene. Given the substantial corner plot upon which the host property sits, there would be no adverse impact on its garden or provision of off-street parking, nor would it adversely affect the outlook of neighbouring properties. Furthermore, given its location within the close it would not create an awkward juxtaposition with a neighbouring property.
7. For these reasons, I conclude that there would be no harm to the character or appearance of the appeal property or the wider area. Consequently, I find no conflict with Policy CS15 of the Core Strategy and Urban Core Plan for Gateshead and Newcastle upon Tyne (2015) or Policies DM20 and DM23 of the Newcastle upon Tyne Development and Allocations Plan (2020) which seek, amongst other things, to ensure that development results in high quality design having regard to character and local distinctiveness. Despite a technical breach of the HDG guidance, the site-specific circumstances of this appeal mean that the scheme would still comply with the overall amenity and design aims of the HDG and those contained within the development plan as a whole.

Conditions

8. I have considered the Council's suggested conditions in light of the National Planning Policy Framework and Planning Practice Guidance. 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 and a condition that requires the external materials to match the existing dwelling. These conditions are required for clarity and to protect the character and appearance of the host building and wider area.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above, having considered the development plan when read as a whole and all other issues raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed subject to the conditions set out above.

K L Robbie

INSPECTOR

¹ Extending Your Home – A Design Guide 4. Front Extensions