



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 July 2024

by N Teasdale BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 July 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/P2935/D/24/3340374

8 Broomhouse Steading, Chatton, Alnwick, Northumberland NE66 5ND

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant full planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Joan Ward against the decision of Northumberland County Council.
 - The application Ref is 23/02821/FUL.
 - The development proposed is a garden room.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The location of the appeal site in the above banner heading has been taken from the decision notice and appeal form as this accurately describes the location of the site.
3. The proposed development has already been completed. The appeal has therefore been assessed on a retrospective basis.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the existing property and surrounding area, including whether it preserves the setting of the Grade II listed Broomhouse Farmhouse and farm buildings to the west of Broomhouse Farmhouse.

Reasons

5. The appeal site relates to an existing dwellinghouse known as No 8 Broomhouse Steading which sits within a row of converted farm buildings which are located within the setting of Grade II listed Broomhouse Farmhouse and farm buildings to the west of Broomhouse Farmhouse. The row of properties are characterised by small scale properties within narrow plots and are of a traditional design with a harmonious appearance.
6. A garden room has been erected to the front of No 8 Broomhouse Steading within the garden area serving the property. It is located against the wall forming the principal elevation of the property and is constructed from timber materials and comprises a number of windows and a door. Although the property is tucked away from the main road which is located to the south of the site, the garden room is clearly visible from entering the access track and from a number of other properties nearby. The stone boundary wall does very little to obscure views.

7. As set out, the appeal site is located within the setting of the Grade II listed Broomhouse Farmhouse and farm buildings to the west of Broomhouse Farmhouse. As such, I have a duty under Section S66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 which requires special regard to be had to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. I have also had regard to paragraph 205 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which states that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation.
8. The building whilst covering a small footprint, appears as a sizable structure in this particular location when considered against the small-scale properties and is an overtly domestic addition to the front of the property which cannot be considered to be subservient. Its overall size and scale along with its design, appears as a highly dominant addition to the street scene at odds with the overall character and appearance of the existing property and row of other properties. There are other structures in the area such as the hopper that serves the boiler and air source heat pumps. However, these features are not comparable to the scheme before me in terms of their appearance, location, and function. At my site visit, I did not see any other similar and dominant additions nearby.
9. I appreciate that the site has changed via the conversion works and that various structures were apparent prior to development of the gardens to the properties. I am however considering the scheme based on the current context of the site opposed to any pre-existing situations and thus this would not alter my findings.
10. The garden room serves the existing property and I note the difficulties regarding access to the rear. This would also not alter my findings in relation to the above main issue. The external timber boarding may not have had time to tone down and may weather over time and the appellant has stated that they would accept some alterations to the building including colour of the window frames. This would not however overcome the harm identified as the garden room is simply too big and out of character in this specific location and the wallpaper used for the back of the shed does very little to reduce its overall prominence.
11. For the reasons given above, the development unacceptably harms the character and appearance of the existing property and surrounding area. It therefore fails to preserve the setting of the Grade II listed Broomhouse Farmhouse and farm buildings to the west of Broomhouse Farmhouse. This would result in less than substantial harm to the significance of the designated heritage asset.
12. Paragraph 208 of the Framework explains that where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use. The benefits associated with the scheme are entirely to the benefit of the occupier by providing additional space/storage at their property. Accordingly, I find that there are no public benefits to offset the identified harm to the setting of the

listed building to which I have attached great weight given the requirements of the Framework.

13. The development is therefore contrary to Policies ENV 1, ENV 7, QOP2 and HOU9 of the Northumberland Local Plan 2016-2036, 2022 which together, amongst other matters, requires development to respect, complement and not have an unacceptable adverse impact on the style and character of the existing dwelling and its setting in terms of its design and use of materials, or on the character of the surrounding area.
14. The development does not conserve the heritage asset in a manner appropriate to its significance, or positively contribute to local character or distinctiveness in line with the aims of Section 16 of the Framework relating to Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment.

Other Matters

15. The property may be the sole residence of the appellant and would allow the occupant to enjoy the garden and surrounding setting to aid personal wellbeing as well as being able to store some gardening equipment. I am also aware of the lack of storage within the existing property. Such matters would not however alter my findings nor weigh in favour of the appeal.

Conclusions

16. The development conflicts with the development plan when considered as a whole. There are no material considerations, either individually or in combination including the provisions of the Framework, that outweighs the identified harm and associated plan conflict. I conclude that the appeal should therefore be dismissed.

N Teasdale

INSPECTOR