
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 June 2021

by Diane Cragg DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 June 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/P2935/W/21/3269706
Moresby, Main Road, Stocksfield NE43 7NJ

- 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 Christopher Raffo against the decision of Northumberland County Council.
 - The application Ref 20/02872/FUL, dated 1 September 2020, was refused by notice dated 21 December 2020.
 - The development proposed is retrospective application for detached granny annex (Amended Description 17/11/2020).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for retrospective application for detached granny annex (Amended Description 17/11/2020) at Moresby, Main Road, Stocksfield, NE43 7NJ in accordance with the terms of the applications 20/02872/FUL dated 1 September 2020 subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be retained in complete accordance with the approved plans. The approved plans for this development are:-
 - 001 Revision R1 Site Location Plan
 - 002 Revision R4 Proposed Site Plan
 - 010 Revision 02 As Built Annex Plans & Elevations
 - 2) The detached annex hereby permitted shall not be used other than for purposes incidental to the use of the dwelling known as Moresby.

Application for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Mr Christopher Raffo against Northumberland County Council. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Procedural Matters

3. I have taken the description of the development from the appeal form as the parties agree that the description was amended during the application process. I have determined the appeal accordingly.

4. Planning permission has been granted for the erection of a single storey 2-bedroom annex extension to the side/rear of the appeal property¹. The appeal proposal includes several amendments to the approved scheme including alterations to the external materials. The annex has been implemented in accordance with the amended scheme using render to the external walls in place of timber cladding. I am therefore considering the appeal retrospectively.
5. The point of contention between the parties relates solely to the use of render on the external walls of the building. I have no reason to disagree with the conclusions reached by the Council in respect of the other amendments to the scheme or matters relating to the determination of the application.

Main Issue

6. Having regard to the above, the main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host property and the area with particular regard to the setting of Forge Cottage, a grade II listed building.

Reasons

7. Moresby is a detached stone-built property in a large plot set back from the Main Road. The front boundary of the property is defined by a stone boundary wall which extends at a lower level down the side boundary to the western side adjacent to a private access route which serves several properties located in Burnside Yard.
8. The area is characterised by a mix of historic and more modern properties. Broadly to the east of the site is a cul-de-sac of relatively modern houses constructed in brown brick with small areas of UPVC cladding. To the west there is a mix of old and new dwellings constructed in stone or brick with outbuildings constructed in stone, brick or timber.
9. The annex building is sited reasonably close to the rear elevation of the house. The arrangement of dwellings either side of Moresby, their proximity to the road frontage and the intervening landscaping limits views to the rear of properties so that from the road frontage the annex building is largely obscured from view. Those properties to the west have some limited visibility in to the rear garden of the appeal site and the annex can be seen from Burnside Yard. The annex is clearly visible from the rear of properties in the adjacent cul-de-sac. I accept that there are limited examples of render in the vicinity of the site, nevertheless, the rendered elevations are tempered by the use of stone to the plinth and as a whole the building's external materials do not appear prominent or incongruous. Those properties adjacent to the rear and eastern side boundaries view the annex in the context of the render on the side of the house and the palette of materials in the area is not so limited that the use of render appears prominent or obtrusive.
10. Moresby and Forge Cottage provide an attractive frontage to the road. The significance of Forge Cottage derives from its architectural quality and history as a former forge. This is illustrated through its roadside location, solid to void ratio, form of openings and hierarchical relationship of the two-storey house to the single storey forge range. Whilst its setting may include the adjacent buildings, the siting of the annex does not detract from the historic relationship

¹ Under Local Planning Authority reference 17/03250/FUL

between them. The annex is not conspicuous from the road frontage and does not detract from the local distinctiveness of the area. The use of render would have a neutral affect on the setting of Forge Cottage.

11. Overall, the use of render would not disrupt the prevailing character of the area or materially diminish the appearance of the appeal site. Nor would it affect the setting of Forge Cottage and in terms of section 66 (1) of the Planning (Listed buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 the setting of Forge Cottage would be preserved.
12. Therefore, I conclude that the development does not detract from the character and appearance of the host property or the area having had particular regard to the setting of Forge Cottage. The development would accord with Policy BE1 of the Tynedale Local Development Framework Core Strategy and Policies GD2, BE22 and H34 of the Tynedale District Local Plan where these policies seek to ensure that development is appropriate to the character of the site and its surroundings. It would also comply with the Framework where it seeks to ensure that development is sympathetic to local character.

Conditions

13. As the application is retrospective a time limit condition is not required. A condition is necessary to identify the approved plans as this provides certainty for all parties. A condition is necessary to restrict the occupancy of the proposed annex to ensure accordance with the development applied for. I have reworded this condition for clarity.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposals would accord with the development plan. Therefore, the appeal is allowed.

Diane Cragg

INSPECTOR