

---

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 January 2017

**by Chris Couper BA (Hons) DiP TP MRTPI**

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

**Decision date: 5<sup>th</sup> January 2017**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/Y2810/D/16/3163540**

**Fieldfare, Stanford Road, Cold Ashby, Northampton NN6 6EP**

- 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 Ms H McCall against the decision of Daventry District Council.
  - The application Ref DA/2016/0762, dated 2 August 2016, was refused by notice dated 13 October 2016.
  - The development proposed is external wall insulation and ground/first floor extensions to the dwelling.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## Procedural matter

2. I understand from the appeal form that the Council agreed to an amended description of the proposal from that stated on the application form. Consequently, and as it is more comprehensive, I have used that amended description in my heading above.

## Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

## Reasons

4. Fieldfare is one property in a small group of buildings accessed via a long drive from Stanford Road. It is a bungalow with a predominantly rendered finish, a linear footprint and a hipped roof. Given its proportions and design it has a relatively simple form and appearance. Although it is a coherent building, I agree with the appellant that it has little architectural interest. Cold Ashby Lodge which sits on lower ground just to the north is a much taller dwelling, and The Byre, on the western side of the drive, is a two storey dwelling finished with brick. This small group, which includes various other buildings, sits in an elevated location in expansive, open countryside.
5. The proposal would include small flat-roofed extensions on the south-western elevation. Notwithstanding their different roof style, given their limited height and scale they would not harm the appearance of the host dwelling, and would be clearly subordinate to it. Consequently, I agree with the Council that those

elements of the scheme, and the proposed external wall insulation to provide a rendered finish throughout, would not cause visual harm.

6. The proposed first floor would have a roof which would be laid out at 90 degrees to the existing roof, and would have a gabled form. Its ridge and eaves heights would be significantly higher than those features on the existing building. Consequently it would have a considerable bulk and would contrast markedly with the form and appearance of the existing dwelling.
7. Whilst the appellant contends that that element of the scheme would provide a strong visual feature which would lift the visual character and appearance of the dwelling, in my view its design would not respect the simple appearance and proportions of the host property, and it would give the whole building a rather disjointed and eclectic appearance. Consequently it would not accord with the Council's advice in its Designing House Extensions Supplementary Planning Guidance that extensions should look as if they belong to the house, and that the roof design be similar.
8. The harm that the proposal would cause to the character and appearance of the host property would also result in harm to the area, although that harm would be tempered by the very limited or long distance views of the site from public vantage points, and by the context of existing tall buildings. Nevertheless, the garden elevation of Fieldfare is clearly visible on the long approach down the private drive.
9. For the reasons above, the proposal would conflict with those parts of policies EN42 and GN2 of the Daventry District Local Plan 2007 which require in broad terms that development enhances and blends well with its surroundings, and with the requirement of policy S10 of the West Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy Local Plan (Part 1) 2014 that development enhances the built environment. As the scheme would not represent good design, it would also not accord with section 7 of the National Planning Policy Framework.
10. I note that the appellant attempted to negotiate an acceptable solution with the Council. The submitted drawing dated 6 October 2016 includes an alternative scheme which the appellant states has an unbalanced feel, but which she maintains was suggested by the Council and therefore demonstrates that it considered two storeys to be acceptable in principle. For its part the Council sets out in its delegated report that that alternative is also unacceptable. Notwithstanding that history, I have dealt with the proposal before me on its merits and I conclude that its design would significantly harm the character and appearance of the host property, which in turn would cause some harm to the area. For those reasons, and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

*Chris Couper*

INSPECTOR