
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 November 2025

by **F Harrison BA(Hons) MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/P2935/W/25/3368787

Roseworth Cottage, Front Street, Longframlington

- 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 Neil Burns of Tompion Developments Ltd against the decision of Northumberland County Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/02500/FUL.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of existing buildings and redevelopment of site with 4no. detached dwellings.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Background and Main Issue

2. There are two reasons for refusal on the decision notice, however the Council has confirmed that a viable and appropriate method of delivering 10% biodiversity net gain (BNG) would be through the purchase of biodiversity units from a registered habitat bank. There is no substantiated evidence which would prompt me to disagree with the Council's conclusions. On this basis, I am satisfied that the biodiversity gain condition¹ is capable of being discharged successfully.
3. As such, the proposal would deliver mandatory BNG, and would comply with Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended), meeting the aims of Paragraph 187 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) that requires planning decisions to contribute to and enhance the environment by, amongst other things, minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity.
4. It would also be in accordance with Policies ENV1 and ENV2 of the Northumberland Local Plan (2022) (NLP) which amongst other things, requires development to minimise their impact on biodiversity and secure a net gain to reflect latest Government policy and advice. Policy LPNP5 of the Longframlington Neighbourhood Plan Made Version 2021 – 2036 (2022) (LNP) reflects the NLP and so the proposal would also accord with this policy.
5. Taking the above into account, the main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

¹ Under Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended), subject to some exceptions, every grant of planning permission is deemed to have been granted subject to the biodiversity gain condition, which requires that at least a 10% increase in biodiversity value is met.

Reasons

6. The appeal site accommodates a detached dwelling fronting the A697. It is surrounded by a mix of plot sizes, dwelling types and styles that are set back from the road by varying distances. While there are differences in design and appearance, the area is characterised by built form that typically fronts the road and the use of traditional materials including stone and slate. The pattern of development is defined by a strong relationship with the street created by the road facing orientation of properties which creates a harmonious character that contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area.
7. The proposed dwellings would sit perpendicular to the road, creating a disconnection from the street frontage. The disjointed orientation of the properties would be prominent in the street scene owing to the topography of the site increasing away from the street. Consequently, the proposal would have an awkward relationship with the prevailing pattern of development and would not fit well into the surrounding context.
8. While Plot 1 seeks to replicate the gable feature of the existing dwelling, the proposal as a whole would introduce a terracing effect which would compound the awkward relationship with the established pattern of development. It is for this reason that, even though Plot 1 would be located in a similar position to the existing dwelling, the proposal would not be reflective of or reinforce the historic form of Roseworth Cottage and the positive contribution it currently makes to the street scene by, amongst other things, its street facing orientation.
9. The appellant is in agreement to the use of traditional materials including stone and slate which would help to assimilate the proposal with its surroundings and could be secured through an appropriately worded planning condition. Nonetheless, the arrangement of development within the site would very clearly have a different relationship with the street than the surrounding built form. This is despite the introduction of design features to the side elevation of Plot 1 to reflect the appearance of the neighbouring Primrose Cottage and the gate in the front boundary treatment and footpath leading to a doorway. While these features would contribute to an active frontage, they would not overcome the incongruity of the layout of the proposal as a whole and its diminished relationship with the street in comparison to the prevailing character and appearance of the area.
10. Perpendicular siting may well add depth, texture and visual interest to a site and can be found in rural areas throughout Northumberland, including in other parts of Longframlington. Nevertheless, this does not indicate that the proposal would sit comfortably within its immediate surroundings. Overall, the proposal would fail to meet the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework which seek developments that are sympathetic to local character and establish or maintain a strong sense of place, using the arrangement of streets and spaces to create attractive, welcoming and distinctive places.
11. It is not the case that a permission² on the rear section of the appeal site has established the principle of the perpendicular siting of dwellings in this location as that permission had a different site boundary, was for two dwellings and did not front the A697. As such, the existing permission does not undermine the character and appearance of the area in the way that the proposal would. Although the

² Ref: 23/03542/OUT

proposal would be a continuation of the scale and form of this permission, and irrespective of the density of nearby modern housings, for the reasons given above the layout of the proposal would draw the eye, unbalancing the otherwise harmonious character of the area.

12. To conclude, the proposal would be unduly harmful to the character and appearance of the area and would be in conflict with NLP policies QOP1 and HOU9 and LNP Policy LNP7. Amongst other things, these policies require development to incorporate high quality design that makes a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness, creating a strong sense of place

Other Matters

13. The principle of residential development at the site is not in dispute, and there is considerable support for boosting the supply of housing. The proposed development would make a positive contribution to the supply of housing in the area, delivering the type of housing that is said to meet local needs on a small windfall site that the Framework recognises are often built out relatively quickly. These are clear benefits which collectively, given the scale of the proposal attract limited positive weight.
14. Although there would be no significant consequences for highway safety and living conditions would be satisfactory, these matters and any other policy compliance including flood risk, drainage and land contamination would be neutral matters, weighing neither for nor against the proposal. As such, overall, the benefits of the scheme are insufficient to outweigh the harm and conflict with the development plan identified under the main issue.

Conclusion

15. My above findings bring the proposal into conflict with the development plan, read as a whole. There are no material considerations that indicate a decision should be made other than in accordance with it. Therefore, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

F Harrison

INSPECTOR