
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 August 2016

by Emma Tinsley-Evans BSoc.Sc MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 21 September 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/L2820/D/16/3152719

1 Main Street, Ashley LE16 8HF

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Mark Morgan against the decision of Kettering Borough Council.
 - The application Ref KET/2016/0154, dated 1 March 2016, was refused by notice dated 29 April 2016.
 - The development proposed is construction of a single storey glasshouse extension to outbuilding.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for construction of a single storey glasshouse extension to outbuilding at 1 Main Street, Ashley LE16 8HF in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref KET/2016/0154, dated 1 March 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Site Location Plan; Block/Site Plan; Existing Elevations Sheet 1 of 1; LtOsrPo 2.5mx6.5m Sheet 1 of 1.
 - 3) The glasshouse hereby permitted shall be constructed of powder coated aluminium and glass. No development shall commence on site until details of the colour of the powder coated aluminium and details (including a sample) of the external brickworks have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall not be carried out other than in accordance with the approved details and be permanently retained in that form.

Preliminary Matters

2. I have used the description of the proposal from the Council's decision notice as this provides a more simplistic version of the proposed development than that given on the planning application form.
 3. Since the appeal was submitted, Policy 13 of the North Northamptonshire Core Spatial Strategy (CSS) as referred to in the Council's reason for refusal, has been superseded by Policies in the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy 2011 – 2031 (JCS) which was adopted by the Council in July 2016. With regard to the appeal the Council states that the contents of Policies 2 and 8 of
-

the JCS expand upon the design and heritage related requirements of the now superseded Policy 13 of the CSS. I have therefore determined the appeal on that basis.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the existing building and the street scene along Main Street.

Reasons

5. The appeal site occupies a prominent corner position at the junction of Medbourne Road, Main Street and Stoke Albany Road. It has an extensive frontage with Medbourne Road and Main Street and there are fairly open views of the site from the street due to the low boundary wall and the fact that it is slightly elevated from the road.
6. The proposed development would be located in the extensive side garden area of 1 Main Street, a substantial and imposing dwelling with a variety of cross gable roofs and tall chimneys. The side garden includes part of a single storey, linear outbuilding with a pitched roof and a stepped ridge and eaves height. The outbuilding extends from Medbourne Road towards the main house and is set back somewhat from Main Street to give the site a fairly open character and appearance. Whilst the outbuilding is of a simpler design than the main house, it is constructed in matching materials and together the buildings harmonise and provide an attractive setting to the entrance of the village.
7. The appeal proposal would see the erection of a glasshouse attached to the outbuilding. It would have a cross gable roof design with the main ridge of the glasshouse running parallel to the street to match that of the outbuilding. The ridge would also be set much lower thereby reducing the prominence of the development and ensuring that the glasshouse would have a subordinate appearance, particularly when viewed from the front.
8. Whilst the outbuilding has a pitched roof with gable end, it forms part of a larger L-shaped building which has a gable facing into the appeal site towards Main Street. Therefore, the cross gable design of the proposed glasshouse would not be significantly at odds with the existing outbuilding which also includes front and side gables; nor is it incompatible with the main house which also exhibits these features.
9. The glasshouse would occupy a central position on the outbuilding and would not extend for a significant length along it. This would allow the majority of the building to remain exposed. The nature of the proposal would also allow sight of the original building through the glass. I do not therefore consider that the glasshouse would be an overly visually dominant feature.
10. Whilst the glasshouse would project from the outbuilding, its size, scale and position would ensure that it does not appear out of proportion with its host, and it would not detract unacceptably from the overall linear form of the outbuilding itself. Moreover, given that the glasshouse would also be set back some distance from Main Street and set in from the side boundary with Medbourne Road, it would not occupy a highly conspicuous position on the site.
11. The proposal would also be read in the context of the wider site, which includes the more grand design of the main house. Whilst there would be detailing on

the ridge of the glasshouse, this would reflect the style of the main house and would not significantly detract from the character of the outbuilding given that the brick base of the glasshouse would be of matching materials.

12. The design of the glasshouse would therefore reflect both the detail and features of the outbuilding to which it would be attached, as well as having regard to the wider context of the site and its surroundings, including the more grand design and architectural features of the main house. It would therefore harmonise with both the outbuilding and the main house and would not have a detrimental impact on the street scene.
13. The Council states that the dwelling at the appeal site is a non-designated heritage asset. I have therefore had regard to paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and for the reasons outlined above, I do not consider that the glasshouse would result in harm to the significance of this non-designated heritage asset on the site.
14. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the existing building or the street scene along Main Street. I find no conflict with Policy 2 of the JCS which seeks to ensure, amongst other things, that proposals complement their surrounding historic environment and minimise harm to heritage assets and their setting. The proposal would also accord with Policy 8 of the JCS which seeks to ensure that development responds to the site's immediate and wider context and local character, amongst other things.
15. I find no conflict with section 7 of the Framework which also requires good design, or section 12 of the Framework which seeks to ensure development conserves and enhances the historic environment.
16. The Council also considers that the proposal would not be in accordance with Policy 11 of the JCS. However, although development in rural areas is specifically referred to in the Policy, it concerns the distribution of development. In my opinion Policy 11 is not therefore relevant to the appeal proposal and it has had no bearing on my conclusions on the issue of character and appearance.

Conditions

17. In addition to the standard time limit condition, a condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans is necessary to provide certainty. A condition relating to the use of external materials is also necessary to ensure the satisfactory appearance of the development.

Conclusion

18. For the reasons set out above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Emma Tinsley-Evans

INSPECTOR