



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 December 2025

by **A.Graham BA(hons) MAued IHBC**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/M4510/D/25/3374776

22 Ullswater Way, Newcastle Upon Tyne NE5 2SL

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Care and Repair Newcastle City Council against the decision of Newcastle City Council.
 - The application Ref is 2025/0819/01/HOU.
 - The application is for erection of two storey extension to front.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for erection of two storey extension to front at 22 Ullswater Way, Newcastle Upon Tyne as per application reference number 2025/0819/01/HOU subject to the conditions as set out in the Schedule below.

Procedural Matter

2. The description as used by the Council differs from that used on the appellant's original application form. I consider that the Council's description describes the proposal just as well and, as such, I have used this description accordingly.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a later 20th century mid terrace house fronting onto a quadrangular green space within a wider post World War II housing estate. The housing enclosing this space line it along three sides and create a garden square of sorts. The design of the houses is unconventional in the fact that they utilise architectural treatments that give a variety to form and scale and I suspect this may have been an intentional device to allow the modern buildings to reflect a more local vernacular.
5. As a result, the houses surrounding the green space contain both very low eaves lines and set backs as well as full two storey elements that are often contrasting with the red brick and are treated with off white or pastel coloured render. Other architectural features include bay windows that are often beneath flat roof porch canopies and velux type, and half velux type windows to the roof scape. There are

some examples of pitched roof dormer extensions that I understand are later modifications.

6. The overall architectural treatment is one of variety and irregularity that, as mentioned above, I consider likely reflects vernacular or an interpretation of arts and crafts traditions. In this respect the buildings surrounding the garden square are successful in their attempt to offer a modern interpretation of such traditions whilst maintaining a generally consistent palate of materials. In this respect I consider that it is these attributes that are of importance for this particular context.
7. The proposal before me seeks permission to extend to the front of this property which would see the currently set back first floor element extended into a low roofed outward extension with a simple pitched roof dormer to the front. In revised plans the dormer has been altered and the porch would also be removed which has unusually enlarged the dormer. The proposal would therefore create a slightly extended ground floor dining area with bedroom above. The justification is to enable a deck lift to help cater better for a disabled person who lives here and I give this desire great weight in my assessment.
8. I also give weight to the Council's Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) on 'Extending Your Home' Design Guide. This guidance reflects both the National Planning Policy Framework (The Framework) and Local Plan Policies CS15 and DM20 in their aspiration for encouraging good design that is contextual and preserves the diverse character of the Newcastle district. The SPD specifically refers to two storey front extensions stating that such interventions can have serious implications for the character of an area. However, the SPD appears to also allow discretion should the character of an area and design of a proposal not cause detriment to the character of an area.
9. In this respect I find that the context of the appeal property is one such scenario that could allow a sensitive front extension to occur. The proposal before me also bears this in mind through using sensitive architectural forms that are synonymous with the character of the houses here. For instance, the low eaves of the roof, pantile roofing materials and the modest pitched roof dormer would all preserve the important irregularity of the streetscene and the character of the square.
10. As such I consider that this proposal, whilst extending to the front, would continue the irregular character that is so apparent here. And, whilst it would alter the original design, I do not consider that such an intervention would necessarily be harmful.
11. As such, and whilst giving great weight to the particular circumstances concerned with the needs of the occupant, I conclude that the policy requirements within Policy CS15 of the Core Strategy and Urban Core Plan as well as Policy DM20 of the Newcastle upon Tyne Development and Allocation Plan are met and that the character and appearance of the area would be preserved.

Conditions

12. I include the standard conditions as suggested by the Council as outlined in the following Schedule.

Conclusion

13. The proposal would not cause such harm to the character and appearance of the area and the architectural context would be preserved. As such the appeal is allowed.

A Graham

INSPECTOR

SCHDEULE OF CONDITIONS

1. The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
2. The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
3. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 1L(01)03 Marked as 'Amended'.