



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 April 2021

by Mr M Brooker DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 April 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/H4505/D/21/3266197

13 Queens Drive, Wickham NE16 4PX

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Ms Cindy Robinson against the decision of Gateshead Council.
 - The application Ref DC/20/00145/HHA, dated 15 February 2020, was refused by notice dated 26 October 2020.
 - The development proposed is a two-storey side and single storey rear extension and front porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue and Preliminary Matters

2. Part E of the appeal form states that the description of development has not changed, even though an alternative description to that detailed on the application form has been entered. The description of development detailed in the banner above it taken from the decision notice. I have used this description because it more accurately and concisely describes the development.
3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. Policy CS15 of the Core Strategy and Urban Core Plan (the CS) and saved Policy ENV3 of the Unitary Development Plan (the UDP) seek to ensure that, amongst other matters, new development responds positively to the local character of the area and the Householder Alterations and Extension Supplementary Planning Document (the SPD) sets out general design guidance for household extensions that aims to "respect and enhance the appearance of the street scene within which the development is to be located".
5. 13 Queens Drive is a semi-detached property with an attached garage, forming part of a short row of similar properties fronting on to Queens Drive. The adjacent property, 12 Queens Drive, is set back from the appeal site and road creating a clear step in the building line at the head of the cul-de-sac.
6. The submitted plans show that the two-storey side extension would be flush with the front elevation of the property and the full width of the appeal site. The extension is shown as running the full depth of the house with a single storey extension to the rear. The existing attached single garage would be replaced by the proposed extension. Consequently, the appeal scheme would

- create a substantial extension that would not appear subservient to the existing dwelling and would appear as an incongruous feature in the street.
7. While the Appellant details that the appeal scheme would use materials that match the existing property this does not outweigh the harm I have identified previously.
 8. Both the Council and the Appellant detail that the proposed scheme would replicate the extension at 8 Queens Drive¹, and my observations at the site visit confirmed this. No.8 is separated by a large garden creating a distinct gap between the properties, a gap that despite the step back of No.8, does not exist in respect of the appeal site. That No.8 has been extended in a manner similar to that proposed by this appeal does not convince me as to the acceptability of the extension shown on the submitted plans.
 9. The Appellant also details a number of other properties in the area that, the Appellant states, are similar to the appeal scheme. I have not been provided with all the details of these schemes, the circumstances and policies that applied at the time they were considered. Nonetheless these extensions are material considerations in the determination of this appeal, and I give them some weight, but it does not outweigh the harm I have identified previously.
 10. I therefore find that, as a result of the considerable scale, form and location of the propose development in relation to the neighbouring property, the proposed development would appear as an incongruous feature in the street that would harm the character and appearance if the area, contrary to Policy CS15 of the CS, Policy ENV3 of the UDP and the relevant guidance of the SPD.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Mark Brooker

INSPECTOR

¹ DC/07/01096/FUL