



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 March 2022

by Diane Cragg Dip TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/P2935/W/22/3290815

The Signal Box, Farley Cottage, Ellingham, Chathill NE67 5HA

- 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 Jenny Freeman against the decision of Northumberland County Council.
 - The application Ref 21/01840/FUL, dated 4 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 30 September 2021.
 - The development proposed is replacement of timber cladding with new natural cedar boarding. Change of balustrade to glazed and patio size as built.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The application was refused by the Council against Officer's recommendation but there is no statement before me to explain the Council's position. Nevertheless, in the absence of anything substantive from the Council there are third party representations which, along with the appellant's submissions, I have had regard to in reaching my decision.
3. I saw at my site visit that works to extend the first-floor balcony have been undertaken.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site is located on the south side of the main road through Ellingham. There is a mixture of dwelling designs within the vicinity of the appeal site. Properties are mostly constructed of stone or render with some wood cladding visible. Stone boundary walls, post and rail fencing, and hedging generally demarcate boundaries. The limited range of materials to properties and boundaries is an attractive part of the character and appearance of the area.
6. The appeal building is a two-storey structure with a small footprint. It is a prominent building when approaching the appeal site from the east. It is also visible in wider views from the road to the south and from adjacent residential properties.

7. The elevated balcony projects out from the side and rear of the building. The opaque glass panels and steel tubular framing of the balcony balustrade jars with the wooden handrail of the stairs, the wood cladding of the appeal building and the stone of the adjacent properties and boundary walls. Because of its raised position, prominence and modern materials, the balcony balustrade is a particularly prominent and incongruous feature and looks harmfully out of place.
8. The appellant describes modern details proposed in the design of the village hall. As described, these features would sit within the building's elevations or roof form. In contrast, the balcony is at a raised level and set forward of the building's elevations. The proximity and design of the village hall does not lead me to a different conclusion on the balcony detail.
9. Although, when constructed, the approved dwelling to the rear of the appeal site may limit views of the balcony from the road to the south, views of it from the east, adjacent residential properties and the village hall site would remain prominent.
10. The balustrade around the balcony at Bridge Cottage is not prominent because it is formed of frameless clear glass. The balcony detail at Bridge Cottage does not set a precedent for the appeal proposal.
11. Overall, I conclude that the proposed development would detract from the character and appearance of the host property and the area, in conflict with Policy F4 of the Berwick-upon-Tweed Borough Local Plan adopted April 1999, where in intermediate areas of landscape value development should accord with its surroundings including in terms of materials and means of enclosure. This is consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks to achieve well-designed places.

Other Matters

12. The Council does not raise any concerns about the access and parking arrangements, cedar cladding, or the living conditions of adjacent residents in relation to the balcony extension and I see no reason to disagree on these matters.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, I conclude that overall, the proposal conflicts with the development plan, and there are no material considerations that would outweigh that conflict. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

Diane Cragg

INSPECTOR