
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 December 2025

by **N Teasdale BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18th December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/H4505/D/25/3373457

1 St Cuthberts Mews, Marley Hill, Wickham, Gateshead NE16 5DG

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant full planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mrs Amanda Dance against the decision of Gateshead Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is DC/25/00285/HHA.
 - The development proposed is erection of an outbuilding in the garden area.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The works as described in the above banner heading has already taken place onsite. The appeal has therefore been assessed on a retrospective basis.
3. On 16 December 2025, the Government published a consultation on proposed reforms to the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). Whilst broad changes to the structure of the Framework are proposed as part of this consultation, these proposals could be subject to further change and can only be given limited weight at this stage. It has therefore not been necessary to consult the parties on the changes, and in reaching my decision I have had regard to the Framework published in December 2024.

Main Issue

4. The main issue of the appeal is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area, including whether it would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of Marley Hill Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

5. The appeal site relates to 1 St Cuthberts Mews, Marley Hill, Wickham which is a detached residential property with a narrow back garden and spacious side garden. It is of traditional design with a tiled gable roof, red brick walls, sash windows with stone headers and cills, and a large stone framed feature on the front.
6. The development seeks planning consent for an outbuilding which has been erected in the garden area to the side of the property. It is built on a slope and includes an elevated platform base and relatively large veranda. Given the level changes on site, the outbuilding sits at a higher level than the dwelling and rear garden area. The outbuilding is single storey with a flat roof and is of a large size.

It is coloured black and made of composite material with large floor to ceiling height doors and windows, timber effect cladding walls and anthracite grey upvc. Its appearance is modern and minimalistic.

7. As mentioned above, the site falls within the CA. I therefore have a statutory duty under Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the CA. It requires special regard to be had to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. I have also had regard to paragraph 212 of the Framework which states that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation.
8. The Marley Hill Conservation Area Character Statement explains that red industrial brick, interspersed with the larger stone institutional buildings, together with Welsh slate are essential in forming the character of the village. It explains that the lack of unsympathetic and garish modernisation in Marley Hill is remarkable.
9. The scale and mass of the outbuilding is not subservient to the house and is made more prominent by its elevation and visible location to the side of the property. It is not a typical modest summerhouse added to appreciate and better use the garden but instead is a large modern flat roofed structure with a featureless appearance. All of which is unsympathetic to the dwelling which is of detailed traditional character. Its contrasting appearance and overall size and scale is prominent in the street scene and unacceptably draws the eye. I appreciate that the grounds are extensive to accommodate a large building but even so, the scale, design, siting and materials of the building is very prominent in this particular location and has a detrimental effect. In coming to such findings, I have had due regard to the planting that has already taken place, but this would not alter my findings as the building is still very visible and prominent from public views.
10. The appellant explains that they are happy to alter the materials etc and undertake further planting to help screen the development. I am not however sufficiently persuaded that such would alleviate my concerns or mitigate against the harm identified. This is because of the size/positioning of the building and topography of the land, and I am not convinced additional landscaping would fully screen the building from views.
11. The development therefore unacceptably harms the character and appearance of the surrounding area. It fails to preserve the character or appearance of the CA. This results in less than substantial harm to the significance of this designated heritage asset. While less than substantial, the prominence and scale of the outbuilding, results in the extent of harm being at the higher end of the spectrum.
12. Paragraph 215 of the Framework explains that where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use. I am aware of the reasoning and need for the outbuilding including the personal circumstances of the family. Whilst I sympathise with the appellant in this regard, the benefits associated with the outbuilding are largely to the benefit of the occupiers by increasing living accommodation at their property. Additional landscaping would

provide some benefit, and I note matters regarding wildlife. However, I find that such would not be sufficient to offset the identified harm to the CA.

13. Overall, there is a high level of less than substantial harm to the significance of the CA and there are insufficient public benefits to outweigh the great weight to the assets' conservation and the considerable importance and weight to this harm. Within the context of my statutory duties, I conclude that the proposal fails to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA. It conflicts with Policy CS15 of the Planning for the Future Core Strategy and Urban Core Plan for Gateshead and Newcastle Upon Tyne 2010-2030, 2015 and Policies MSGP24 and MSGP25 of the Making Spaces for Growing Places Local Plan Document, 2021. These policies amongst other matters, explain that development will contribute to good place-making through the delivery of high quality and sustainable design, and the conservation and enhancement of the historic environment.
14. For the same reasons, the proposed development would also be contrary to section 16 of the Framework relating to conserving and enhancing the historic environment and Gateshead Council's Household Alterations and Extensions Supplementary Planning Document.

Other Matters

15. As referred to earlier, I appreciate that the development would significantly improve the family's living space/quality of life, and I have had regard to the personal circumstances put forward. However, the development still lacks subordination and balance with the general form of the host property and surrounding area, and such matters would not be sufficient to justify harmful development.
16. In considering this appeal, I have had due regard to the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) set out under Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010, in particular the need to eliminate discrimination against persons with the protected characteristics of age and/or disability, advancing equality of opportunity for those persons and fostering good relations between them and others. Following careful consideration of the family circumstances, I am satisfied that the impact of dismissing the appeal is proportionate and necessary.

Conclusion

17. The development conflicts with the development plan when considered as a whole. There are no material considerations, either individually or in combination including the provisions of the Framework, that outweighs the identified harm and associated plan conflict. I conclude that the appeal should therefore be dismissed.

N Teasdale

INSPECTOR