

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 January 2017

by D J Barnes MBA BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 2nd February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Y2810/D/16/3162037

**Sibbertoft House, 11 Berkeley Street, Sibbertoft Northamptonshire
LE16 9UF**

- 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 Matthew Tait against the decision of Daventry District Council.
 - The application Ref DA/2016/0599, dated 13 June 2016, was refused by notice dated 8 August 2016.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a single storey extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. It is considered that the main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the appeal building.

Reasons

3. The appeal building is a former Victorian rectory which has been sub-divided into 2 dwellings. Each dwelling has a separate access, entrance and garden. The dwellings have been altered by the erection of single storey additions albeit their design is not wholly sympathetic with the character and appearance of the building, particularly in respect of their roofs. The proposed development is a single storey addition to what is a side elevation of the appellant's property but, as evidenced by the entrance porch, was the original front elevation of the building.
 4. Notwithstanding the previous additions and sub-division, the original form, design and character of the building are still generally legible. Much of the building's original detailing has been retained including the decorative brick banding, hipped porch canopy and generally well-proportioned windows with decorative brick arches above. For these reasons, I share the Council's assessment that the building is a significant non-designated heritage asset and Policy BN5 of the West Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (JCS) is material to the determination of this appeal. This policy includes reference to the
-

conservation and enhancement of non-designated heritage assets in recognition of their individual significance and contribution to local distinctiveness and sense of place.

5. The building's southern elevation is of the greatest interest because of its design, appearance and relationship with the adjoining landscaped garden. However, the western and northern elevations also make a positive contribution to the appearance of the building because they have retained much of their original detailing and character. By reason of the additions, the eastern elevation makes the least positive contribution to the building's character and appearance.
6. Although the building is sited in an elevated location, because of the boundary wall, outbuildings and No. 15, the proposed development would not be noticeable from public viewpoints along Berkeley Street. There would be views of the appeal scheme from the vehicular drive and front garden of No. 17 but only if the boundary hedge was removed. Even if the hedge was removed this matter alone might not be a reason for this appeal to fail provided the scale of harm caused to this significant non-designated heritage was not unacceptable. This reflects the balanced judgement required by paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework).
7. As part of the appeal scheme's design, the appellant has sought to respect some of the building's detailing with the use of external materials to match the existing brick and slate. However, this is a case where the design and scale of the appeal scheme would be an unsympathetic extension which would fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of this non-designated heritage asset. When the design and scale are considered together with the siting of the proposed extension then it would visually compete with the adjacent porch. The pitch of the proposed gable roof would not respect or reflect those of the host building's more steeply pitched roofs, including the roof of the adjacent porch. Further, the design of the doors and windows of the appeal scheme would fail to adequately replicate the fenestration of the building, in particular the size and proportions of the proposed windows either side of the doors.
8. Although there are some elements which weigh in favour of the appeal scheme, including the brick detailing and choice of materials, these matters are significantly and demonstrably outweighed by the harm which has been identified. For these reasons, it is concluded that the proposed development would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the appeal building and, as such, it would conflict with JCS Policy BN5 and Policy EN42 (part A) of the Daventry District Local Plan. This Local Plan policy requires development to blend well within the site and surroundings and its design promotes or reinforces local distinctiveness and enhances its surroundings. This policy is consistent with the Framework's core principle of securing high

quality design. Accordingly, and taking into account all other matters, it is concluded that this appeal should be dismissed.

D J Barnes

INSPECTOR