



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 27 July 2025

by A Hartley LLB (Hons) Solicitor MBA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/P2935/D/25/3366869

25 Woodlea, Newbiggin-by-the-Sea, Northumberland NE64 6HQ

- 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 Stephen Mileham¹ against the decision of Northumberland County Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00498/FUL
 - The proposed development is a two-storey extension by way of demolition of existing outhouse.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Issue

2. The appellant submitted alternative drawings² with the appeal evidence. I find the changes proposed to be substantially different from the drawings submitted with the original application in that the length of the proposed extension would be reduced. The appeal process should not be used to evolve a scheme, particularly where it would deprive those who should have been consulted on the changed development the opportunity of such consultation. Therefore, in the interests of fairness and transparency to all parties, I have determined the appeal on the basis of the plans considered by the Council.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on
 - the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area, and
 - the living conditions of the occupiers of No. 23 Woodlea, with particular regard to privacy and outlook.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

4. The appeal property forms the left-hand half of a pair of two-storey, semi-detached, red brick houses. It is situated at a prominent corner within the street scene of Woodlea. I noted on my site visit that the ground level at No. 25 is much higher than the neighbouring dwellings around the corner, including No. 23. The

¹ The planning application form and plan titles state "Mileham", the appeal form states "Milham".

² PL306(20)02-Rev1

surrounding area is characterised by properties of similar traditional design, form and materials. The uniformity of the semi-detached dwellings provides a pleasing symmetry and rhythm within the street scene.

5. The appeal proposal would demolish the existing small scale, single-storey outhouse and introduce a two-storey side extension. The extension would be set back from the front elevation and have a lower ridge height than the host dwelling and so appear subservient. However, even though it would extend to the footprint of the existing outhouse, at two-storeys it would unbalance the building and would disrupt the symmetry and uniformity evident in the street scene. It would also be unduly prominent at this visually open corner of Woodlea, due to its height and massing at the higher ground level.
6. Consequently, the appeal proposal would result in harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. This is contrary to policies QOP1, QOP2 and HOU9 of the Northumberland Local Plan (2022) (LP) and policy N1 of the Newbiggin-by-the-Sea Neighbourhood Plan (2023) (NP). These policies, amongst other things, require household extensions to respect and complement the character of the surrounding area and make a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.
7. The development would also conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), which seeks to ensure that development is sympathetic to local character including the surrounding built environment, and which establishes or maintains a strong sense of place.

Living Conditions at No. 23

8. There are no daylight or sunlight assessments available within the evidence before me. From my observations on site, I find it likely that the appeal proposal would reduce the amount of sunlight available to the rear garden area of No. 23. However, I am not convinced that the proposal would cause unacceptable harm in relation to loss of sunlight or daylight within the habitable rooms or rear garden, due to the orientation of the buildings.
9. Due to the differing ground levels and existing relationship, the level of privacy within the small rear outdoor area and the habitable rooms at No. 23 is already compromised to some extent, as it can be overlooked from the rear garden of No. 25. The introduction of a two-storey side extension that would extend to the footprint of the existing single-storey outhouse, and would incorporate rear windows to habitable rooms, would further compromise the privacy of the occupiers of No. 23 to an unacceptable level by increasing the opportunity of overlooking.
10. Due to the position and height of the proposal, it would also give rise to an undue sense of overbearing, resulting in an unacceptable impact on outlook for the occupiers of No. 23.
11. Consequently, I find that due to its height and proximity to No. 23, the proposal would result in an adverse overbearing impact on the outlook from No. 23 and an unacceptable loss of privacy. It would therefore conflict with policies HOU9, QOP1 and QOP2 of the LP and policy N1 of the NP. These policies, amongst other things, require that development respects residential amenity regarding outlook and privacy, supports health and wellbeing and enhances quality of life. The

development would also conflict with the Framework, which seeks to achieve good design with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

Conclusion

12. In conclusion, having regard to all relevant representations made, I find that the appeal development conflicts with the development plan when read as a whole and with the provisions of the Framework. There are no material considerations that would justify a decision other than one in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, the appeal should be dismissed.

A Hartley

INSPECTOR