



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 October 2025 by J Reed MPlan

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 January 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/P2935/D/25/3370108

1 Ford Terrace, Riding Mill, Northumberland NE44 6EJ

- 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 Turner against the decision of Northumberland County Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/01066/FUL.
 - The development proposed is described as “creation of a roof terrace over first floor bathroom, accessed from existing dormer window.”
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for “creation of a roof terrace over first floor bathroom, accessed from existing dormer window” at 1 Ford Terrace, Riding Mill, Northumberland NE44 6EJ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 25/01066/FUL, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with: Location Plan, AE201 P1, AP002 P1 and AP000 P1.
 - 3) The external materials of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.

Appeal Procedure and Main Issues

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 scheme. The main issues in regard to which are the effects of the proposed development on a) the character and appearance of the area; and b) the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring dwellings with specific regard to privacy.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Character and Appearance

3. The appeal building is a two storey end terraced dwelling. It has a flat roofed ground floor extension abutting what appears to be a more historic two storey outrigger. There is a flat roofed box type dormer window in the rear of the original roof. There is a brick outbuilding in a small yard. Others in the terrace have also been altered at the rear in a number of ways. The wider area is a mix of architectural styles.

4. The roof terrace would not be typical of the dwelling nor a manner in which others have been extended but it would nonetheless be viewed in a very much evolved and varied context. It would be a small, lightweight and largely unobtrusive permeable feature alongside the much larger box dormer. It would be a contextually very small component of the townscape overall. It would be to a rear elevation which can be viewed via what appears to be a shared private access but there would be a very limited public realm effect arising out of the addition.
5. Consequently, the appeal scheme would not harm the character and appearance of the area. Such that it would comply with Policy BR 2 of the Broomhaugh and Riding Neighbourhood Plan 2023 (NP), Policies HOU 9, QOP 1 and QOP 2 of the Northumberland Local Plan 2022 (NLP) and the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). These all seek, amongst other things, for development to make a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.

Living Conditions

6. Whilst the roof terrace, by virtue of its elevation and projection, would allow views into the rear gardens of Number 2 Ford Terrace and others, they would be interrupted by some dense foliage to the rear of neighbouring properties. There is already a degree of mutual overlooking between the dwellings themselves due to their tightly clustered siting. The windows in the dormer curve round to the side which gives a clear line of sight down into the rear garden of Number 2 specifically.
7. Users of the appeal scheme would, by virtue of the siting of the roof terrace, likely use it to sit out with views directed to the picturesque setting of the valley beyond the settlement. Making it less likely they would choose to look sideways. With this and the above in mind, the proposals would not introduce any new overlooking such that the existing situation would materially change. As a result, they would comply with Policy BR 2 of the NP, Policies QOP 1, QOP 2 and HOU 9 of the NLP and the Framework which all seek, amongst other things, for development to not cause unacceptable harm to the amenity of existing and future occupiers.

Conditions

8. Time limit and plans conditions are necessary to provide certainty for enforcement. A matching materials condition will ensure a suitable outward appearance. Given my above assessment, I do not deem privacy screens necessary.

Conclusion and Recommendation

9. For the reasons given above, the appeal scheme would comply with the development plan. The appeal should therefore be allowed.

J Reed APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

10. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted, subject to the aforementioned conditions.

John Morrison INSPECTOR