



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 August 2024 by J Reed MPlan

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 01 November 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/P2935/D/24/3347696

25 Marine View, Seaton Sluice, Northumberland NE26 4JY

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Neil Henderson against the decision of Northumberland County Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/00048/FUL.
 - The development proposed is removal of rear conservatory and new single storey flat roof extension in lieu with roof lantern.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on a) the living conditions of the occupants of Nos 26 and 24 Marine View with specific regard to outlook and natural light; and b) the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Living Conditions

4. The appeal building and its immediate neighbours (Nos 24 and 26) form, as near as makes no difference, a terrace. Their gardens are therefore side by side and rear elevations in close proximity. There is a close boarded timber fence forming the boundary between the appeal building and No 26, and similar but with brick lower sections and pillars to No 24.
5. No 26 has a L shaped single storey extension to the rear. The shortest extent of which lies on the boundary with the appeal site. With this in mind, the projection, height and solidity of the proposed extension would all but enclose the space inside the aforementioned L shape which is to the immediate rear of No 26. Users therefore would thus feel hemmed in through a much lower quality outlook, an effect which would extend to the ground floor rear windows. The blank expanse of the new side elevation wall would appear inescapably dominant and overbearing which would exacerbate the situation.

6. The existing conservatory has an effect on these matters, but it is set slightly off the boundary, does not project as far and presents a much more lightweight and permeable. The fence is much lower than the full height of the proposed extension. There are therefore some noticeable differences between the existing situation and the proposed.
7. In terms of No 24, its rear elevation is set some considerable distance inwards of the rear extent of where the new extension would be. As a result, the total reward project of the appeal building, when taking into account what has gone before, would be in the region of six metres. There is a patio area to the immediate rear of No 24 and its ground floor windows are in a similar relative position to No 26. That said, the new extension would remain open (as a supported canopy) as it runs closest to the shared boundary with No 24 and as such, given the additional rearward projection would be marginal, the situation would not be vastly different to what it is now. Natural light to the rear of No 24 would thus not be any materially worse.
8. Be this is as it may, the appeal scheme would still cause harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of No 26 in the manner I have described. As such, it would conflict with the aims of Policies QOP 2 and HOU 9 of the Northumberland Local Plan 2021 (LP) which requires development to consider the effect upon the surrounding environment and amenities of occupiers of nearby properties amongst other things.

Character and Appearance

9. The appeal site is a two-storey property in a residential area. Marine View consists of other similar properties with gardens to the front and rear. Behind the appeal site is Astley Gardens which contains semi-detached bungalows. There are a range of different extensions of different heights and roof types situated to the rear of the properties on Marine View. The proposed extension would be viewed in this context. The wider area is also varied in its architectural styles. I can therefore only conclude, taking into account also the scale of the proposals, that they would have an overall neutral impact on the host property and the area.
10. The proposed extension will be marginally larger than the existing conservatory. The principle of built form of this size at the property is established and thus the proposed single storey extension would not be obtuse. The extensions to the rear of the appeal site are read as clearly subservient by virtue of their single storey form and flat roof design. The existing conservatory and canopy also do not relate overly well to the existing property due to their design and roof pitch. The proposed extension, whilst differing in roof design to the existing property, will be constructed in matching materials and of a sufficiently relatable design and in this respect will be an improvement over the existing situation.
11. With this and the above in mind, the scheme would not conflict with LP Policies QOP 2 and HOU 9 which seek to ensure that, amongst other things, development is well integrated into its context and enhance the built environment.

Other Matters

12. No alternative scheme demonstrating how a reduction in the depth of the proposed extension is before me. In any case, the appeal process should not

be used as a means to evolve a scheme and what is before me should be what the Council issued a determination on. Any changes should be addressed with a fresh application to the Council in the first instance. I am also aware of examples of extensions on other local dwellings but, in the absence of any further details pertaining to the circumstances present at the time they were approved, if they were, I cannot be certain they are sufficiently similar to the appeal scheme such that my findings would change.

Conclusion and Recommendation

13. Whilst I have found in favour of the appellant on the second main issue, this would be a lack of harm and thus a neutral matter. There would be development plan conflict arising out of the first main issue against which there are no sufficiently weighty material considerations to find otherwise in accordance. I therefore recommend the appeal be dismissed.

J Reed

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

14. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR