



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 March 2022

by Mr M Brooker DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 April 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/P2935/D/22/3294558

127 Bondicar Terrace, Blyth, Northumberland NE24 2JZ

- 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 Peter Shahzad, Akhtar & Rashida Saleem against the decision of Northumberland County Council.
 - The application Ref 21/03371/FUL, dated 19 August 2021, was refused by notice dated 22 February 2022.
 - The development proposed is part demolition of existing residential ancillary/incidental outbuilding with extension, new gable ended roof, raised ridge and two inward facing dormer windows to outbuilding and new decking area.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. Since the determination of the application, the Northumberland Local Plan (NLP) was formally adopted by the Council on 31 March 2022. The parties were afforded the opportunity to comment on the new policies.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the appeal scheme on the character and appearance of the area, including the Bondicar Terrace Conservation Area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property lies within the Bondicar Terrace Conservation Area (the CA), the significance of which lies within the form of the detached residential properties set in large verdant plots which record the wealth and suburban development of the Blyth in the late 19th century.
5. Policies ENV7 and ENV9 of the NLP, amongst other matters, seeks to protect heritage assets, such as conservation areas from harmful development.
6. I saw at the site visit that a number of other properties on Bondicar Terrace accommodated a range of outbuildings, those that I saw were generally of a typically domestic scale and subservient in size and scale to the host dwelling.
7. The existing outbuilding subject of this appeal is already notably larger than many other outbuildings in the area and in combination with the position, immediately adjacent to the road, is consequently a notable feature.
8. The submitted plans show that the already substantial outbuilding would be extended at the ground floor and at the roof, raising the ridge and changing

from hip to gable ends. The proposed dormer windows would face into the appeal site and would largely not be visible from the road.

9. As a result of the increased size, height and scale I find that the appeal scheme would be an incongruous feature in the local area, harming the character and appearance of the area, including the CA. While the appellant has referred to hay lofts and the height of stable structures being typical of substantial period properties such as the appeal dwelling, I did not identify any of these structures in the local area during my site visit.
10. I am statutorily required¹ to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the CA. As a result of the size, scale and in particular the height of the appeal scheme I find that the proposal would cause less than substantial harm to the significance of the CA.
11. The Framework advises that where a proposal would cause less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal². Any harm should require clear and convincing justification³.
12. The benefits identified by the appellant, specifically including the change from hipped roof form to a more traditional gable and the creation of more internal space for the appellant do not overcome the harm that I have identified above, harm that I am required to give great weight to.

Conclusion

13. The proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area, including the CA in conflict with the development plan taken as a whole. There are no material considerations that indicate the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, for the reasons given, I conclude that the appeal should not succeed.

Mr M Brooker

INSPECTOR

¹ Section 72(1) - Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

² Paragraph 202 – National Planning Policy Framework

³ Paragraph 199 – National Planning Policy Framework