



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 March 2025

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

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2 April 2025

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/H4505/D/25/3358569**

**45 Cromer Avenue, Chowdene, Gateshead NE9 6UL**

- 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 Mrs Debora Egan against the decision of Gateshead Metropolitan Borough Council.
  - The application Ref is DC/24/00849/HHA.
  - The development proposed is described as “single storey to the front in line with existing porch and double side extension on the north side”.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development in the banner heading above is taken from the application form. However, the proposal could be more accurately summarised as proposed two storey side and single storey front extensions, and I have dealt with the appeal on this basis.
3. I have noted some discrepancies in the submitted plans. The proposed roof plan shows that the ridgeline of the extension would run through with that of the existing dwelling, although the proposed north elevation shows this would be set back from the main ridge. The proposed north elevation does not show the proposed lean-to roof form to the single storey element of the extension as indicated in the proposed west elevation and roof plans. However, I have enough detail before me to form the basis of my overall planning assessment. Had I been allowing the appeal I would have pursued this matter further with the parties.

### Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area, with particular reference to the two storey side extension.

### Reasons

5. The appeal property is a two storey semi-detached dwelling within a residential area. It sits in a prominent and elevated position fronting the estate road, facing towards dwellings and gardens at a lower level on Cromer Avenue and at the junction with Newquay Gardens. The pair of semi-detached dwellings comprising the appeal property and its neighbour are set apart from other semi-detached properties, which are the predominant house type to the western side of Cromer Avenue. A small group of detached dwellings are located to the rear of the appeal

- site and blocks of two to three storey residential units are located to the north and south.
6. There are variations in the layout and design of other semi-detached properties in the area, including the extent and appearance of single and two storey side extensions. The property adjoined to the appeal site has a first floor side extension above the width of its garage, with a ridgeline and front wall in line with those of the original dwelling.
  7. I have had regard to the Council's Household Alterations and Extensions Local Development Framework Supplementary Planning Document (2011) (SPD). This highlights that two storey and first floor extensions can have a significant impact on the street scene and poor design can destroy the original symmetrical concept of semi-detached properties. The SPD states that as a general rule, side extensions should be no more than 50% of the overall width of the original dwelling to remain subordinate to the host dwelling. The SPD also states that the ridgeline should be lower than that of the host property and the front wall set back no less than 1 metre from that of the original building, at least at first floor level.
  8. The side extension would have a width more than 50% of the two storey element of the original dwelling but would not double its width as suggested in the officer report. I have also had regard to the extent of the proposed extension in relation to the width of the existing garage. However, despite attempts at subservience with the setting down of the ridge and the set back of the front elevation, the proposal would result in a substantial and overly dominant extension to the side of the property.
  9. The proposed extension would be out of scale with the form of the existing dwelling and the pair of semi-detached properties, and it would be a discordant addition that would adversely impact on the street scene. On other aspects of the design, the first floor window to the front elevation would accentuate the width and overall scale of the extension in comparison to the appearance of the original property and the adjoining dwelling. The adverse visual impact would also be exacerbated by the dwelling forming part of the street scene in a highly prominent and elevated position.
  10. I note the space to the side of the dwelling and beyond the site boundary compared to other semi-detached properties in the area, which are generally more constrained in width given the layout with their neighbour. However, these are not matters that would mitigate the adverse effects of the proposed development and make it acceptable.
  11. I do not know the circumstances under which other side extensions I saw in the area were constructed or their status with regard to planning permission. The appellant specifically references the extension of the adjoining neighbour, although this does not extend as far to the side of the property as the appeal proposal. I therefore cannot draw any direct comparison from other properties that have been extended with the proposal that would weigh in its favour. The presence of these does not justify the harm that I have otherwise found.
  12. I conclude that the proposed development would be materially harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. It would therefore conflict with Policy CS15 of the Planning for the Future Core Strategy and Urban Core Plan for Gateshead and Newcastle upon Tyne 2010-2030 and

Policy MSGP24 of the Making Spaces for Growing Places Local Plan Document for Gateshead (2021). These policies seek, amongst other matters, that development will contribute to good place-making through the delivery of high quality and sustainable design, and taking into account the proposal's compatibility with local character including relationship to existing townscape and frontages, scale, height, massing, proportions and form.

### **Other Matters**

13. The appellant suggests that the side extension could be carried out as permitted development, albeit they refer to allowance for a single storey side extension and the appeal proposal is for a two storey extension. However, this is not a matter for me to determine in the context of an appeal made under Section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. It is open to the appellant to apply to have the matter determined under Sections 191 or 192 of the Act. Any such application would be unaffected by my determination of this appeal. I have dealt with the case before me on its planning merits.
14. I note the appellant's concerns over the Council's handling of the application. However, this is not a matter that I can consider under this planning appeal and does not alter my findings, in which I have had regard solely to the planning merits of the development as proposed.

### **Conclusion**

15. The proposal conflicts with the development plan and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal is dismissed.

*N Armstrong*

INSPECTOR