



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 15 June 2021

by Paul Martinson BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 July 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/H4505/D/21/3270793

13 Killowen Street, Gateshead, Tyne and Wear NE9 6EX

- 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 Mr Paul Green against the decision of Gateshead Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref DC/20/00656/HHA, dated 22 July 2020, was refused by notice dated 5 February 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as: 'proposed bedroom over garage & front porch'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a semi-detached dwelling set back from the road behind a small front garden and driveway. I saw a high level of symmetry between the appeal property and its neighbour, due in part, to the consistent arrangement of fenestration and matching bay windows and canopies. Unlike its attached neighbour, 15 Killowen Street, the appeal property has a garage extension to the side which sits slightly forward of the main elevation of the dwelling. As this is only a single storey element, the original form of the dwelling is easily apparent and, has little effect on the symmetry of the two dwellings.
4. As a pair of semi-detached dwellings, the appeal property and No 15 are distinctive, being located in an area of predominantly terraced housing, and consequently add variety to the streetscene. To the west of No 15 is a terrace of dwellings which step down the hill as the road slopes down in this direction. A comparatively older and more substantial terrace of dwellings is located to the east, which lies within the Low Fell Conservation Area (the CA). The appeal property has a single storey garage that sits between the main part of the dwelling and the adjacent terrace, albeit set in from the boundary slightly. This gap helps to retain the distinction between the older terraced housing and the pair of semi-detached dwellings. Although outside its boundary, the appeal site lies within the surroundings in which that Conservation Area is experienced and therefore falls within its setting.

5. The proposed first floor extension would be constructed above the existing garage close to the boundary with 11 Killowen Street and flush with the main existing front elevation. The roof would be continued over the extension without any break or step so that the roof planes of the extension would be flush with those of the existing dwelling. This approach would elongate the two-storey element of the appeal property leading to it appearing out of proportion with its attached neighbour and over-dominant, eroding the symmetry across the two dwellings. The pair of semi-detached dwellings would appear unbalanced, and the resulting discordant appearance would have a significantly harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area.
6. The proposal would result in a continuation of the appeal property towards the adjacent terrace. This continuation would erode the distinction between the two elements of the streetscene, adversely affecting the distinctiveness of the terraced housing, particularly in views from the junction of Killowen Street and Jessel Street. The lack of a break in the roof form would exacerbate this effect, which would adversely affect the setting of the Conservation Area.
7. The Gateshead Household Alterations and Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (2011) (the SPD) advises that poorly designed extensions can destroy the symmetry of semi-detached houses which are normally designed as a matching pair. In order to ensure side extensions are subordinate it advises that they should be set back from the main front wall or the side boundary by a minimum of one metre with the roof also set lower than the height of the existing ridgeline. As the proposal would conflict with this guidance, this reinforces my conclusion above.
8. Whilst the appellant advises that there is a mix of housing styles in the area and a lengthened elevation may reflect neighbouring terraced dwellings to the east, I have found that, as semi-detached dwellings, No 13 and No 15 add variety to the character and appearance of the streetscene which would be diminished by the appeal proposal. I note the appellant's comments that it is not likely to be possible for No 11 to be extended towards the appeal site to create a 'terracing effect', however, whilst there are merits in avoiding a terracing effect, this would not overcome the harm identified above.
9. For the above reasons, I have found that the proposal would be significantly harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area, including the CA. The proposal would therefore conflict with Policy CS15 of the Gateshead Core Strategy and Urban Core Plan (2015), Policies MSGP24 and MSPG25 of the Gateshead Making Spaces for Growing Places Local Plan Document (2021) and the SPD which require development to be of a high quality design that responds positively to local distinctiveness and conserves and enhances heritage assets, including their setting. It would also fail to accord with the design objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, having considered the development plan as a whole, along with all other relevant material considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Paul Martinson

INSPECTOR