



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 August 2025

by K L Robbie BA (Hons) DipTP MTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10th September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/M4510/W/25/3365927

19 Stoneyhurst Road, Gosforth, Newcastle Upon Tyne NE3 1QU

- 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 Aimee Thompson against the decision of Newcastle Upon Tyne City Council.
 - The application reference is 2025/0155/01/HOU.
 - The development proposed is the construction of a dormer extension to the rear of the main roof, including raising the ridge and installation of five no. rooflights to the front main roof slope.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The appellant submitted amended plans, which removes two windows in the face of the dormer, as part of the appeal and requested that I determine it on this basis. I am normally required to deal with an appeal on the basis of the same plans that informed the Council's decision. Nonetheless, and irrespective of the merits or otherwise of either scheme, I have considered whether it would be appropriate to take the amended scheme into account. I have concluded that given the nature of the proposal, and the opportunities that interested parties, including the Council, have had to make comments on them, in this instance it would not prejudice any party for me to take the amended scheme into consideration. I have therefore made my decision on this basis.

Background and Main Issues

3. There is no dispute between the parties as to the acceptability of the proposed insertion of rooflights into the front roof slope. Therefore, I have confined my consideration to the proposed dormer on the rear elevation, which involves raising the ridge height of the roof of the appeal property. Therefore, the main issues are the effect of the development on:
 - The character and appearance of the appeal property and the surrounding area; and
 - The living conditions of the occupiers of 150 and 152 Audley Road with particular regard to outlook, light and privacy.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

4. The appeal property is a two-storey end terraced dwelling situated in an established residential area. It is one of several similar properties on Stoneyhurst Road, which notably have ridges lower than the main terraces to which they are connected. The proposal is for a flat roofed dormer to the rear elevation which involves raising the height of the ridge of the dwelling.
5. The Council's Householder Design Guide '*Extending Your Home*' (Updated 2011) advises that in most instances only pitched roof dormers are appropriate to reflect the character of the host property. It goes on to advise that dormers on the rear elevation should be designed to be in proportion to the overall size of the roof and should be dropped below the ridge of the original roof so that it appears subservient. 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.
6. The proposal would extend almost the full width and height of the rear roof slope and would take up almost the entire rear roof slope of the appeal property. Rather than sitting below the ridge of the original roof, the ridge would be raised, and the dormer would be level with the raised roof height. There would be no window openings in it. It would therefore appear as a box-like structure and would dominate the rear elevation of the appeal property.
7. The rear roof slope of this side of Audley Road is absent of any dormer extensions. This gives the roofscape a uniform and harmonious appearance. Whilst the proposal would not form part of the main roofscape of the terrace it would introduce a feature which is otherwise alien to this environment and would therefore not be in-keeping with the prevailing character of the terrace. The overall bulk of the proposed dormer would dominate the end of the terrace and would be highly visible within the street scene, both from the rear lane and from Stoneyhurst Road where the side return of the dormer would be visible.
8. Newcastle Upon Tyne's Development and Allocations Plan 2020 (DAP) Policy DM20 does not specifically address dormers. Nevertheless, it provides general design principles applicable to all types of development and require development to be of high-quality design and is therefore relevant to my deliberations in that regard.
9. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would 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 DAP Policies DM20 and DM23 of These policies apply to all development to ensure that it responds positively to local distinctiveness and character, providing a high-quality environment to existing and future occupiers and protecting the character and quality of existing buildings and the surrounding area.

Living Conditions

10. In its amended form the dormer would have no windows in its rear face. Therefore, there would be no overlooking of, or loss of privacy for, the occupiers of either 150 or 152 Audley Road (Nos.150 or 152).

11. The proposed development would involve increasing the height of the ridge of the host property. The dormer would also be a substantial addition to the roof of the appeal property. However, I have no substantive evidence before me to demonstrate that either would lead to a loss of light to windows to the rear of either Nos.150 or 152.
12. Consequently, I find that there are no materially adverse effects arising from the development which would harm the living conditions of the occupiers of 150 or 152 Audley Road with regard to privacy, outlook or light. There is, therefore, no conflict with DAP Policy DM23, which amongst other things, seek to ensure that new development is of high quality and provides a high standard of amenity for existing and future users including a good standard of outlook and privacy for all existing and future occupiers of buildings.

Other Matters

13. I acknowledge that the proposals would result in enlarged accommodation which would benefit the appellant. Whilst I note that the provision of family accommodation could be a general benefit of the proposal. I have no evidence before me to suggest that there is a lack of four bedroomed accommodation nor conversely that there is an oversupply of two-bedroomed properties in the area. This matter does not lead me to an alternative conclusion and does not outweigh the harm that I have found on the first main issue.
14. The appellant has drawn my attention to several other dormer extensions in the locality. A dormer at 17 Stoneyhurst Road differs in scale to the proposal and the host property has a different roof arrangement at the rear which means that the dormer is not as prominent in the street scene as the appeal proposal would be. Other examples cited appear to be located on semi-detached properties in a different context to that of the appeal property and are therefore not directly comparable with the appeal proposal. Whilst at least one may be visible from the appeal property, the physical separation of the appeal property from them is significant. In any event the fact that other dormers in the locality may have been permitted is not a reason, on its own, to allow unacceptable development. As such, I attribute limited weight to any comparison with them, and they do not lead me to an alternative conclusion on the main issues set out above.

Conclusion

15. 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