



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 March 2025

by H Jones BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 31st March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/P2935/D/24/3356809

The Bothy, Callerton Hall Drive, High Callerton, Northumberland NE20 9TT

- 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 and Mrs McKain against the decision of Northumberland County Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/02782/FUL.
 - The development proposed is a single storey glass room located on the rear elevation of the property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. Amongst the evidence before me, submissions have been made which query whether the proposed development would constitute permitted development and, thereby, not require planning permission. Within the context of an appeal under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (the Act) it is not within my remit to formally determine whether the proposed development requires planning permission. To ascertain whether the proposed development would be lawful, an application under section 192 of the Act could be made. As necessary, I return to the matter of permitted development rights later in my decision.
3. The appeal site is situated within the High Callerton Conservation Area, and listed buildings are located nearby. As a result, in making my decision, I have had special regard to sections 66(1) and 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.
4. On 12 December 2024, a revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published. In making my decision, I have had regard to the revised Framework and any comments in respect to it submitted by the appeal parties.

Main Issues

5. The main issues are:
 - Whether the proposed development would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt having regard to the Framework and any relevant development plan policies; and
 - Whether the proposed development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the High Callerton Conservation Area.

Reasons

Green Belt

6. The Framework sets out the particular types of development which do not constitute inappropriate development within the Green Belt. One of these development types is identified at paragraph 154 c), and it comprises of the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building. The Framework defines what is meant by an original building. It is a building as it existed on 1 July 1948 or, if constructed afterwards, as it was built originally.
7. Planning permission for The Bothy was granted in November 2012¹. The description of the development permitted on the Council's decision notice reads "Construction of 3 bedroom dwelling incorporating existing stone wall, creation of residential garden, car parking and means of enclosure on the site of former garage/storage building." This description indicates that The Bothy was a replacement building.
8. The relevant plans associated with that planning permission do show that The Bothy incorporated some remnants of an earlier building, however, these remnants comprised only a very modest proportion of the dwelling overall. The Bothy is, therefore, a quite recently erected dwelling rather than a conversion of a much older building. The original building in this case is the dwelling erected as a consequence of that 2012 planning permission and not the building which was on the site before that.
9. The evidence before me indicates that The Bothy has not been the subject of any significant extensions since it was first built and that its size in volumetric terms amounts to around 485m³. The glass room extension would add a further 65m³ to it. This would amount to a modest volumetric increase of the original building by approximately 13%, considerably below the 33% increase which the Council has cited it has used historically as a benchmark for determining when an extension would be likely to be disproportionate. Furthermore, that the proposed extension would utilise a significant amount of glass would assist in reducing its mass in comparison to the largely stone-built original dwelling.
10. For these reasons, the proposed extension would not amount to a disproportionate addition to the original building. Therefore, the proposed development would not be inappropriate development within the Green Belt having regard to the Framework: it would comply with the development type set out at paragraph 154 c). Policy STP 8 of the Northumberland Local Plan 2016-2036 (the LP) relates to development within the Green Belt and, amongst other matters, it sets out that development which is not inappropriate in the Green Belt, as defined in national planning policy, will be supported. Given this, as I have identified that the proposal would not be inappropriate development set against the policies of the Framework, it follows that the proposal accords with STP 8.

High Callerton Conservation Area (the CA)

11. The CA's significance as a whole is largely derived from its collection of traditionally designed estate village buildings which are retained within a historic

¹ Planning permission 12/02198/FUL

layout and spatial distribution. The CA has a strong sense of cohesion which stems principally from the buildings within it exhibiting a traditional appearance including as a result of the traditional materials like stone, slate and timber used in their construction. The traditional design exuded by the CA prevails even though evidence before me indicates that relatively recent developments, including the erection of The Bothy and some building conversions, have taken place. Views of the countryside to the CA's edges also contribute positively to the CA and reinforce an understanding of its agricultural origins. Therefore, the significance of the CA mainly arises from its architectural and artistic interest, because of its aesthetics, but also its historic interest as it provides evidence of estate settlements and agriculture in the past.

12. Although The Bothy is a relatively recently built dwelling, it has clearly been designed to be reflective of, and sympathetic to, the prevailing traditional design of the CA. This is demonstrated by the likes of its steeply pitched roofs and its building materials such as stone to its elevations, slate to its roofs and the timber used to its main window frames and doors. As a result, it assimilates harmoniously into its surroundings and, for this reason, contributes positively to the character and appearance of the CA as a whole.
13. The Bothy's existing single storey rear offshoot contains quite a considerable amount of glass. However, the glass is framed by stonework, and the offshoot is served by a steep dual-pitched and slate-covered roof. As a result, the offshoot's quite liberal use of glass remains sympathetic to the property because of its particular design. Similarly, there are elements of some of the nearest neighbouring buildings to The Bothy which incorporate quite significant amounts of glazing but, again, because of the particular design approach adopted, these elements are appropriate in their contexts.
14. The appellant submits that comparisons can be made between the proposal and some other additions to properties in the area with a walkway at Rebellion House specifically referenced. However, the designs of these cited additions are not before me neither are their planning statuses or the history which has led to their erection. In the absence of information such as this, it is not possible for me to make accurate comparisons to the circumstances of the proposal before me. For this reason, I cannot attribute meaningful weight in my decision to the property additions cited by the appellant.
15. Unlike The Bothy's existing offshoot, the proposed extension would not incorporate the stone or slate to solidify it. Owing to the sheer amount of glass it would feature, it would instead have a very light-weight appearance which would be at odds with the robustness of the stone and slate materials which are so characteristic of the host property and the CA. The extension's roof would have a shallow pitch which would be divergent from the steeper pitches more commonly found within the CA. Furthermore, the proposed extension's structure would be formed of a dark coloured aluminium. This would be inconsistent with the light-coloured timber appearance of most of the window frames and doors within The Bothy and which commonly feature at neighbouring properties. Altogether, this means that the proposed extension would have a design which would harmfully contrast with The Bothy and its immediate surrounds rather than be in sympathy with them.
16. For these reasons, the proposed development would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA. The harm to the designated heritage asset

would be less than substantial. Even so, having regard to the relevant statutory duty I set out earlier, this harm is a matter of considerable importance and weight in my decision.

17. In coming to these views, I have taken account of the appellant's submission that the proposed extension would be demountable. However, I have no reason to conclude that, once erected, it would not be in place for a considerable length of time. Its demountable nature does not, therefore, provide adequate mitigation for the harm I have identified.
18. The purpose of the proposed extension may be to provide a sheltered area within the garden and provide an overall enhancement to the useability of the property. However, principally, the benefit which would be derived from this would be a private one and certainly no public benefits would arise from the proposal which would be of sufficient weight to outweigh the harm I have identified to the CA.
19. Therefore, for the reasons I have set out, the proposed development would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA. As a result, the proposal conflicts with Policies QOP 1, QOP 2, HOU 9, ENV 7 and ENV 9 of the LP. Altogether, and amongst other matters, these Policies require developments to respect, complement and make a positive contribution to local character, reinforce the local distinctiveness of conservation areas whilst setting out that any less than substantial harm to a conservation area should be weighed against the proposal's public benefits. The proposal also conflicts with Policies PNP 2 and PNP 5 of the Ponteland Neighbourhood Plan which require developments to achieve high-quality design, protect and add to an area's distinctiveness and character, and conserve and, where appropriate, enhance the significance of heritage assets.

Other Matters

20. Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) (the GPDO) provides permitted development rights for extensions to dwellings. However, limitations and conditions apply.
21. The proposed dwelling is not detached. As a result, the maximum projection permitted by the GPDO in this case is 3m from a rear wall. The proposed extension would not project beyond the back of the existing single storey offshoot, but it would, nevertheless, extend from a rear wall of the property by almost 4m, well beyond the 3m permitted by the GPDO. Furthermore, the plans indicate that the proposed extension would join onto the side elevation of the existing single storey offshoot. Within a conservation area, an extension beyond any side wall of a dwelling is not permitted development.
22. For these reasons, and even though it is not for me to formally determine whether or not the proposed development constitutes permitted development, it is quite clear to me that it would not. Consequently, in this case, permitted development rights do not provide a fallback position of any meaningful weight.
23. The proposed extension may not harm the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers, however, an absence of harm in such regards is a neutral factor in my decision. Therefore, it cannot outweigh the harm I have identified in my second main issue.

24. The CA includes a concentration of Grade II listed buildings: Newton Cottage, Oriel House and Coach House and the separately listed garden walls and gateways to their south, Rebellion House, Callerton Hall and its separately listed gateway, and Callerton House. Much of the significance of these listed buildings stems from their architectural and artistic interest because of their traditional aesthetics. However, historic interest is also provided as they inform upon the historic functioning of a rural settlement. Several of the listed buildings are located on the opposite side of a road to the proposed extension, and there would be no or very limited intervisibility between them. Even those listed buildings which are positioned closer to the proposed location of the extension would benefit from some separation, including, as a result of The Bothy's existing rear offshoot. The Council has not set out that the proposed development would result in any detrimental effects upon the significance of the various listed buildings and, in the circumstances, I have no reason to come to a different view.

Conclusion

25. Whilst I have concluded that the proposed development would not constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt, this does not outweigh the harm that would be brought about because of the proposal's effects upon the CA. Due to this harm, I have identified conflict with several development plan policies, and I find that the proposal conflicts with the development plan as a whole. There are no material considerations of sufficient weight to indicate a decision other than one in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

H Jones

INSPECTOR