



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 October 2024 by J Reed MPlan

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 December 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/P2935/D/24/3347970

4 Bevan Court, Hepscott Park, Northumberland NE61 6FH

- 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 Mr Alex Smithson against the decision of Northumberland County Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/00863/FUL.
 - The development proposed is the construction of a garage extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for the construction of a garage extension at 4 Bevan Court, Hepscott Park, Northumberland NE61 6FH in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24/00863/FUL, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin no later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing nos: Location Plan no. 01.A3, Proposed site plan drawing no. 21.A3, Proposed Ground Floor Plan drawing no. 22.A3, Proposed First Floor Plan drawing no. 23.A3, Proposed Front Elevation drawing no. 24.A3, Proposed Garage Elevation drawing no. 26.A3, Proposed Side Elevation drawing no. 27.A3 and Proposed Elevations drawing no. 25.A3.
 - 3) The external materials of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.

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 Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal property is a two-storey L shaped detached dwelling with an integral double garage situated in the centre of a cul de sac. The street is characterised by other large two storey detached properties of varying designs and configurations. That being so, there is a homogeneity to roof shape,

materials, general form and siting which creates a pleasing consistency in the street scene. This contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area.

5. The construction of a single storey garage to the side elevation would mirror the stepped roof form and profile of the existing dwelling. It would be read as a subordinate addition and the Council find it would be acceptable in regard to its scale and massing. I see no reason to disagree. The Council refer to an effect on building lines, but do not quantify this specifically. There is no indication of why building lines are important or to what building line specifically the appeal building belongs.
6. The properties either side of the entrance to the estate sit within a clear building line with the exception of the appeal site and the other corner plot property opposite. They bear no obvious linear relationship to the surrounding properties due to their placement and positioning. The size and position of the extension would therefore, with this and the above in mind, be readily absorbed into the existing dwelling and the street scene without any adverse effects thereon.
7. Consequently, the proposal would not result in a harmful effect on the character or appearance of the host property or the area. As such it would comply with Policies HOU 9 and QOP 1 of the Northumberland Local Plan 2022 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2024. These policies and guidance, amongst other things, seek to ensure that development and residential extensions are of a high-quality design that complement the host property and respect and enhance the local character of the area.

Other Matters

8. I am mindful that the Council's reason for refusal addressed the impact of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area alone. I am nevertheless satisfied that the small scale, design and siting of the scheme would not result in an adverse effect on the living conditions of surrounding occupiers or highway safety. Third parties have also highlighted concerns that the appeal site is being used for commercial purposes. This would however be a matter to be dealt with through an appropriate enforcement investigation by the Council and not as part of this appeal.

Conditions

9. Time limit and plans conditions are necessary and reasonable in order to provide certainty and for enforcement purposes. A condition requiring matching materials is necessary in the interests of good quality inclusive design.

Conclusion and Recommendation

10. For the reasons given above, the appeal scheme would comply with the development plan and there is nothing sufficiently compelling to indicate otherwise. I therefore recommend that the appeal should be allowed, subject to the conditions set out above.

J Reed

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

11. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed, subject to the conditions stated.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR