



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 June 2020

by Alison Scott BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8 July 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/P2935/W/20/3249199

Cruel Syke, Haydon Bridge, Hexham NE47 6NE

- 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 Lynne Heslop against the decision of Northumberland County Council.
 - The application Ref 19/00568/FUL, dated 5 February 2019, was refused by notice dated 19 September 2019.
 - The development proposed is Conversion of residential swimming pool into holiday cottage including lounge extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. It is evident upon inspection that a porch extension has been erected to the west side of the building.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the principle of extensions to the building.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is located on an elevated position on the North Road outside Haydon Bridge. There is a combination of other dwellings within close relationship to the appeal site. The former pool building is positioned to the south side of the main dwelling and is constructed of stone and is rectangular in shape, and is built to take account of the sloping nature of the site.
5. There are no objections raised by the Council with respect to the principle of the conversion to holiday let, however it is the extensions of both a porch and lounge extension to the east side, that is in contention by the parties. The appellant explains that without the construction of the lounge extension to the building, a holiday accommodation would not be a feasible option.
6. Policy TM8 of the Tynedale District Local Plan 2007 (LP) permits visitor accommodation where it involves the conversion of existing buildings. LP Policy BE11 permits the change of use or conversions of buildings in the countryside provided they meet certain criteria including the use is holiday accommodation; the building is of permanent and substantial construction; the building is

capable of conversion without major or complete construction or extensions; its use would not cause adverse effect on rural amenities.

7. In respect of Policy GD1 of the Tynedale Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2007 (CS), this policy seeks, amongst other considerations, for the development in the open countryside to be limited to the re-use of existing buildings. The proposal is not in conflict with this policy. Nor is the proposal in dispute with Policy TM8 of the LP as it would consist of the conversion of existing buildings.
8. The appellant queries the interpretation of the wording of Policy BE11 (b) as she considers that it allows for extensions to buildings provided they are not major. To my mind, criteria (b) should be read as two separate commodities in that the conversion of existing buildings in the open countryside is permitted provided the building is structurally sound and capable of conversion without major or complete reconstruction, *and* (my emphasis) the building is structurally sound and capable of conversion without extensions. I do not disagree with the Council's interpretation of the policy.
9. On this basis, I find no conflict with Policy TM8 of the LP or Policy GD1 of the CS. However, by virtue of the extensions proposed to this existing building, it does not meet the requirement of criteria (b) of Policy BE11 of the LP as it would not be capable of conversion without the proposed extensions.

Other Matters

10. I know of no reason to prevent the appellant from exercising the permitted development rights at the site although this is for the appellant to explore further.
11. Another example of what appears to be a garden room extension at Grindon Farm in Northumberland National Park has been brought to my attention by the appellant. However, the circumstances of this site are not before me and therefore I offer no comment.
12. Complaints by the appellant about the service by the Council should be in the first place directed to the Council, and is not for me to consider as part of this appeal.

Conclusion

13. The appeal is dismissed.

Alison Scott

INSPECTOR