



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 April 2022

by Geoff Underwood BA(Hons) PGDip(Urb Cons) MRTPI IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27th April 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/P2935/D/22/3293485

**70 Shielfield Terrace, Etal Road, Tweedmouth, Berwick-upon-Tweed,
Northumberland TD15 2EE**

- 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 Mrs Louise Lough against the decision of Northumberland County Council.
 - The application Ref 21/02724/FUL, dated 2 July 2021, was refused by notice dated 1 December 2021.
 - The development proposed is the construction of a new garage workshop on site of former garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the construction of a new garage workshop on site of former garage at 70 Shielfield Terrace, Etal Road, Tweedmouth, Berwick-upon-Tweed, Northumberland TD15 2EE, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 21/02724/FUL, dated 2 July 2021, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: BL5304(PL)001, BL5304(PL)002, BL5304(PL)003 and BL5304(PL)004.

Preliminary Matter

2. Since the Council made its decision and the appeal was submitted, the Northumberland Local Plan 2016-2036 (Local Plan) has been adopted and forms part of the development plan. I have therefore determined the appeal on that basis, taking any views in respect of this change into account.

Main Issue

3. The main issue raised by this appeal is the effect the development would have on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The proposed workshop would occupy a considerable area of a modest plot which lies between two back gardens and a football ground. It would be larger and taller than the small partly open car port currently on the site although its footprint would not be greatly in excess of that of the two garages previously on the site.

5. Despite the upsweep at its corner, the relatively low height of the existing wall to the rear of 74 Shielfield Terrace's garden would mean that the proposed building would be prominent from the rear of that house and its neighbour given its height and relatively close proximity to the gardens. However, this effect would be localised, and the low roof pitch proposed would assist in minimising the effect of its overall bulk and height. Whilst it would be very obvious and more prominent than existing or previous buildings on the site, its visual impact on existing occupiers and those using the lane would not be so great as to be obtrusive or materially harmful.
6. The standing seam zinc for its flank walls and roof, with recessed timber gable elevations would contrast with the more utilitarian sectional garages opposite and the stone and slate houses. However, whilst these materials would be different, they have the potential to enliven the unremarkable parking court onto which it would face and the contrast with the houses would not be a harmful one.
7. From the adjacent football ground it would be noticeable as many of the rear gardens running down to its edge do not have outbuildings. However, it would only be a small component in the wide views from the football ground towards the rear of properties on Shielfield Terrace, a backdrop against which it would appear subordinate. Its visual impact would be moderated when seen in the context of the existing garages and the flat roofed, white painted bungalow at 76A Shielfield Terrace. The narrow width of the lane leading from the street and the enclosing effect of the buildings that line it would render it almost hidden from Etal Road.
8. The proposed workshop's overall mass and scale would not be so excessive that considered within its context it would harm the character and appearance of the area. Consequently, it would avoid conflict with Local Plan Policies HOU 9(2) and QOP 2(2) which require good design for householder proposals.

Other Matters

9. Whilst the structure would be prominent from the house and garden of No 74, given the length and orientation of the garden any effect on light or of shadowing would be limited and not result in an unacceptably harmful effect on the enjoyment of, or outlook from, that property. Concerns have been raised about legal implications that may arise on parts of the site that have been acquired from the Council. However, I see no reason why allowing this appeal would negate or supersede any legal restrictions which may be in place on the land. Accordingly, this matter has not had any bearing on my assessment of the planning issues in this appeal.

Conditions

10. Specifying the approved drawings creates certainty for all parties.

Conclusion

11. The proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the area, would accord with the development plan taken as a whole, and material considerations do not indicate the proposal should be determined other than in accordance with it. Consequently, for the above reasons, the appeal is allowed.

Geoff Underwood

INSPECTOR