



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 May 2025

by K L Robbie BA (Hons) DipTP MTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 May 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/M4510/W/25/3362004

54 Sackville Road, Newcastle upon Tyne NE6 5TA

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Ms. Sharuna Sagar against the decision of Newcastle upon Tyne City Council.
 - The application reference is 2024/1700/01/HOU.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a dormer to rear pitched roof. Installation of 3no. Rooflights to front pitch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Background and Main Issue

2. There is no dispute between the parties as to the acceptability of the proposed insertion of rooflights into the front roof slope. Based on the evidence before me I am satisfied that this aspect of the appeal proposal would not cause material harm to the character and appearance of the area, and I have not been made aware that this element would result in any conflict with any development plan policies. Therefore, I have confined my consideration to the proposed dormer on the rear elevation.
3. In the light of the above, the main issue is therefore the effect of the proposed rear dormer on the character and appearance of the appeal property and its surroundings.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is an upper Tyneside flat located within a terrace of other similar properties. There are no other dormers on either the front or rear elevations of the properties within this section of the terrace nor are there dormers on the rears of properties on Rokeby Terrace facing the appeal proposal.
5. The Council's Householder Design Guide 'Extending your Home' advises that large box dormers can result in a top-heavy appearance that harms the character of the host dwelling and so are not generally acceptable. It also sets out guidance on the position of dormers to ensure they are visually subservient. The proposed dormer would be a flat roofed and would extend across the majority of the width of the appeal property and almost the full depth of the rear roof slope.
6. A dormer of these proportions would fail to appear subservient to the host property, consequently, it would cause to the character and appearance of the host building. Whilst it would not be visible from Sackville Road, it would be highly visible within the rear lane which forms part of the public realm in this location. Moreover, it would be clearly visible from Stanmore Road, and also from surrounding properties

causing harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The lack of visibility from Sackville Road itself is no basis for allowing the proposal.

7. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would significantly harm the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area. Thus, it conflicts with Policy C15 of the Core Strategy and Urban Core Plan for Gateshead and Newcastle Upon Tyne 2015 and Policies DM20 and DM23 of Newcastle upon Tyne's Development and Allocations Plan 2020. These policies apply to all development to ensure that it responds positively to local distinctiveness and character and provide a high-quality environment to existing and future occupiers.

Other Matters

8. The appellant has drawn my attention to a number of other dormer extensions in the locality. The examples cited appear to vary in scale and design and are located on a variety different property types within the area, and I do not have their full details before me. None are visible within the context of the appeal proposal. Nevertheless, from those which I was able to see on my site visit rather than providing justification for the appeal proposal, if anything, their presence points to a need for such proposals to be carefully controlled if the character and appearance of the area is to be safeguarded. As such, I attribute limited weight to any comparison with them.
9. The proposal would not have any adverse impact any trees and soft landscaping or the living conditions of future or existing occupiers. Nor would not have a detrimental effect on highway safety. These factors do not diminish the harm that I have found on the main issue and do not weigh in favour of allowing the appeal. I acknowledge that there have been no objections from neighbouring residents, however a lack of objection does not equate to a lack of harm.

Conclusion

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

KL Robbie

INSPECTOR