



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 December 2023

by K L Robbie BA (Hons) DipTP MTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 January 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/M4510/D/23/3330659

10 Southlands, Newcastle Upon Tyne NE7 7YH

- 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 Sammy Man against the decision of Newcastle Upon Tyne City Council.
 - The application Ref 2023/0012/01/HOU, dated 4 January 2023, was refused by notice dated 27 July 2023.
 - The development proposed is an extension built on top of existing garage. Rear dormer roof extension. Installation of roof light in front elevation. Internal alterations. Loft conversion to provide a bedroom and en-suite.
-

The decision is issued in accordance with section 56 (2) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 as amended and supersedes that issued on 17 January 2024.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The Government published a revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) in December 2023. This does not materially change the planning policy context in respect of the main issues, and I have determined the appeal accordingly.
3. Plans of the proposed front elevation supplied by the appellant differ to those supplied by the Council. The Council have confirmed that their decision was made based on the following drawing number: 10 Rev A. I am mindful that it is not the purpose of the appeal process to evolve a scheme and it is therefore important that what is considered by the Inspector is essentially what was considered by the Council. I have therefore proceeded to determine the appeal based on the plans used by the Council to determine the application. The merits of the amended front elevation would, if necessary, be a matter for the main parties to consider as part of a fresh proposal away from this appeal.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the appeal site and the surrounding area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a two-storey, semi-detached dwelling situated on Southlands in an established residential part of the city. It forms one half of a

- pair of dwellings situated between Denewell Avenue and Eastlands. The street and those surrounding it are characterised by similar semi-detached properties.
6. The proposal is for a side extension at first floor above an existing garage, a pitched roof side dormer and flat roofed dormer on the rear elevation. The property has been previously extended at the ground floor to the rear.
 7. The Council's Householder Design Guide '*Extending Your Home*' (Updated 2011) (HDG) advises that dormers on the side elevation of a property should be set in from the eaves and ridge so that they appear subservient to the main roof. Where a dormer is located on a property on an end plot the installation of a dormer window is likely to have a significant impact upon the street scene. Furthermore, dormer extensions on the side elevation of a hipped roof extension are not likely to be considered acceptable.
 8. The two-storey side extension and side dormer elements of the proposal would be prominent in views along Southlands from the west. The brick side elevation of the side extension would appear incongruous and out of keeping with the rendered upper floors of the surrounding properties, which would be further exacerbated by the side dormer which would be flush with the eaves rather than set back into the roof slope. Furthermore, the proposed dormer would occupy a significant proportion of the rear roof slope and would, therefore, fail to appear subservient to the host property. Overall, I consider that the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the appeal property and the street.
 9. The appellant has drawn my attention to a similar extension on Southlands immediately opposite the appeal property. Whilst I do not have the full details of that proposal and how it came into being, it is evident that the context of that property differs from the proposal before me in that it lies within a row of properties and therefore its side elevation is far less prominent in the street scene. Furthermore, its side dormer is stepped in from the eaves and the dormer on the rear appeared less expansive across the roof scape than the proposal before me.
 10. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would significantly harm the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area. Thus, there is conflict with Policy C15 of the Core Strategy and Urban Core Plan for Gateshead and Newcastle Upon Tyne 2010-2030 and Policies DM20 and DM23 of Newcastle's Development and Allocations Plan 2015-2033. I have also had regard to the HDG, which adds weight to my conclusion in this respect. These policies and guidance seek to ensure high quality design that protects the character and quality of the existing building and the surrounding area.

Conclusion

11. 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.

KL Robbie

INSPECTOR