



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 July 2025

by **David Cross BA(Hons) PgDip(Dist) TechIOA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W4515/D/25/3366318

26 West Wynd, Killingworth, North Tyneside NE12 6FP

- 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 Mr Paul Dalby against the decision of North Tyneside Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00209/FULH.
 - The development proposed is removal of existing roof. New pitched roof with gables to form a loft conversion with dormer and 3no. rooflights to the rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The Council requested that I view the appeal site from 28 West Wynd and I was able to do so at my visit.
3. The description of the development provided on the planning application form has been replaced by an amended version on the decision notice and in subsequent appeal documents. I consider that subsequent description to accurately represent the proposal and I have therefore used it within this decision.
4. The Council has raised concerns about the accuracy of the submitted site plan. However, based on the evidence before me and observations on my visit, I consider that I have sufficient understanding of the site and its relationship with the surrounding area to enable me to reach a decision on this Appeal. This includes my consideration of the living conditions of residents of No 28.

Main Issues

5. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on the:
 - Character and appearance of the host property and the area; and
 - Living conditions of residents of No 28 with regards to outlook.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

6. The appeal dwelling currently has a hipped roof with a relatively shallow pitch. Although there are some examples of hipped roofs in the surrounding area, by far the most common roof form on this part of the estate is pitched gable roofs. Indeed, given the predominant style of roof in the area and the prominent corner location of

the appeal site, the hipped roof design of the dwelling is a relatively incongruous feature within the streetscape.

7. The proposal would replace the hipped roof with a gable roof of an increased height. The Council's concerns relate to the increase in height rather than a change in the angle of pitch of the roof. The increase in height of the roof would be readily apparent in views along the streetscape. However, given the variety of house designs in the area, including a number with roof gables facing onto the street, the proposed roof would not be an overdominant or incongruous feature in respect of the host building or the streetscape. Although the peak of the gable would be significantly higher than the eaves lines on the sides of the existing dwelling, the front and rear eaves lines would be retained so that the roof would be sympathetic to the main elevations.
8. The proposal would also lead to an increase in the relative height compared to the bungalow at No 28. However, this would not be to an incongruous degree given the mix of designs of dwelling in the area and the predominance of gable roofs on 2-storey properties.
9. The proposal includes a dormer window to the rear, which due to the location and layout of the appeal site would be readily apparent from the public realm. Unfortunately, the rear elevation of the dormer would be a relatively large and stark feature with a window of a limited scale. The height of the dormer and placement of the window would also jar with the proportions and fenestration of the lower floors of the host building. Due to its scale and proportions, the dormer would be a feature of a clumsy appearance that would not sit comfortably on the rear roofslope of the host dwelling or within the streetscape.
10. This harm would be exacerbated as dormers on the main roofs of dwellings are not a feature of this estate. The few dormers that I did see were on secondary roofs, such as over garages, and were of a more sympathetic design which appeared to be part of the original dwelling. Although the lack of dormers on main roofs may be due to limitations arising from roof profiles, this does not negate the fact that dormers on main roofs are not part of the prevailing character of the area.
11. Notwithstanding my comments in relation to the gable roof, I conclude that the rear dormer would lead to significant harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the area. The proposal would therefore be contrary to the design requirements of Policies DM6.1 and DM6.2 of the North Tyneside Local Plan 2017 (the Local Plan). The proposal would also be contrary to the advice of the Design Quality Supplementary Planning Document 2018 (SPD) with regard to dormer windows being of an appropriate scale and design.

Living Conditions

12. Due to the relative arrangement of the dwellings, the increase in height and the introduction of gables would not be readily apparent from windows of main habitable rooms within No 28.
13. The increase in the height of the roof and the introduction of gables would be apparent from the front and rear gardens of No 28. However, the pitch of the roof would slope away from views to the front and rear of No 28 which would mitigate the increase in height to a degree. Although the extra bulk and massing introduced by the gable roof would be apparent, this would not be of a degree that would

warrant the refusal of planning permission given the relationship of the appeal site with No 28 and the effect on the outlook from that neighbouring property.

14. I therefore conclude that the appeal proposal would not harm the living conditions of residents of No 28 in respect of outlook. The proposal would therefore not be contrary to the amenity requirements of Policies DM6.1 and DM6.2 of the Local Plan or the advice of the SPD.

Other Matters

15. I have had regard to the benefits of the proposal. The economic benefits arising from a potential increase in Council Tax would be very limited given the scale of the proposal. The proposal would improve accommodation for residents of the dwelling, but this is a private benefit and carries very limited weight in favour of the appeal. Due to the harm to character and appearance, I do not consider that the proposal would be an effective use of the site. The no more than limited weight given to the benefits of the proposal would not outweigh the significant harm I have identified.

Conclusion

16. Notwithstanding my conclusions in respect of living conditions, the proposal would lead to significant harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the area. The proposal would therefore be contrary to the design requirements of the Local Plan when read as a whole.
17. There are no material considerations that indicate the appeal should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. For the reasons given above, I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

David Cross

INSPECTOR