



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 February 2022

by David Cross BA(Hons) PgDip(Dist) TechIOA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 February 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/P2935/D/21/3286178

23 Shoresdean, Berwick-Upon-Tweed TD15 2NJ

- 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 David Purvis against the decision of Northumberland County Council.
 - The application Ref 21/03062/FUL, dated 30 July 2021, was refused by notice dated 7 October 2021.
 - The development proposed is alterations and rear extension to dwellinghouse.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for alterations and rear extension to dwellinghouse at 23 Shoresdean, Berwick-Upon-Tweed TD15 2NJ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/03062/FUL, dated 30 July 2021, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Location Plan, 18/310 A3 003 and 18/310 A1 002A.

Preliminary Matter

2. The application for the proposal was submitted retrospectively, and development including a rear extension was in place at the time of my visit.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the wider area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is a semi-detached bungalow located in the small housing estate of Shoresdean. Although there is some variation in the design of the dwellings, the roof-forms are relatively consistent and give this group of dwellings a pleasing conformity.
5. The Council expresses concern about the flat-roofed design of the proposal. However, the extension is located to the rear of the property and is not prominent in views from the public realm to the front of the site. I also saw that there were a variety of extensions and outbuildings to the rear of nearby properties, including some with flat roofs. Whilst they may not be of the same scale or nature as the appeal proposal, the extension does not appear to be

- unduly large or incongruous within that context or in respect of the host building, including in views from the wider area to the rear of the site.
6. The appellant also emphasises that the extension only marginally exceeds the property's permitted development rights. Based on the evidence before me, a flat roofed extension of a similar scale and location to the appeal proposal could be constructed as permitted development, and I give this significant weight as a fallback position in favour of the appeal.
 7. I conclude that the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling or the wider area. The proposal would therefore not conflict with policy F3 of the Berwick-Upon-Tweed Local Plan 1999 in respect of being in accordance with its surroundings, or the National Planning Policy Framework in respect of achieving well-designed places.
 8. There are no material considerations that indicate the application should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. For the reasons given above, I therefore conclude that the appeal should be allowed. I have not imposed a condition in respect of the commencement of development due to the retrospective nature of the appeal. I have imposed a condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the submitted plans in the interests of certainty.

David Cross

INSPECTOR