
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 May 2017

by Ian McHugh Dip TP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 23 May 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Y2810/D/17/3168565

White Lodge Farm, Kettering Road, Walgrave, Northamptonshire, NN6 9PY

- 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 William Main against the decision of Daventry District Council.
 - The application Ref DA/2016/0445, dated 3 May 2016, was refused by notice dated 10 November 2016.
 - The development proposed is a detached garage with ancillary play room above.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a detached garage with ancillary play room above at White Lodge Farm, Kettering Road, Walgrave, Northamptonshire, NN6 9PY, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref DA/2016/0445, dated 3 May 2016, 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 the following approved plans: SK500; SK510; EX001; EX002; EX003; PL100; PL101; PL102; and PL103.
 - 3) Prior to any development commencing on site, details and samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the building hereby permitted, shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the setting of White Lodge Farm, which is a Grade II Listed Building.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a former farmhouse, which is situated in an elevated position in a rural location. It is approached from Kettering Road via a long private drive, which serves the appeal site, other dwellings and neighbouring commercial uses. The commercial uses are housed in some of the former agricultural buildings. These buildings are grouped to one side of the appeal property. A public footpath crosses the driveway and adjoining agricultural land, but it is relatively distant from the appeal site.
-

4. The proposal is to erect a detached building close to the entrance into the appeal site, on the opposite side of the driveway to the existing buildings. The building would provide a garage and workshop on the ground floor and a playroom in the roof space. It would be sited on land that is grassed and planted with some small trees, which has the benefit of a Lawful Development Certificate for use as a garden. The proposed building would be constructed of natural stone with a slate roof and timber (oak) windows. In that regard, it would be acceptable in terms of its appearance and it would not appear at odds with other built development on the site.
5. In considering proposals for planning permission, the duty imposed by Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 is that special regard must be had to the desirability of preserving the setting of listed buildings. Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), sets out policies for the conservation and enhancement of the historic environment and requires the identification and assessment of the significance of heritage assets (which in this case is the Listed Building).
6. The Council refers to Saved Policies GN2 and EN42 of the Daventry District Local Plan 1997 in its decision notice. In my opinion, Policy GN2 is most relevant to the appeal. This Policy states (amongst other things) that planning permission will normally be granted for development, provided that it will not adversely affect a listed building and its setting. I also note that Policy BN5 of the West Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy states that the historic environment, landscapes and their settings will be conserved and enhanced.
7. The listing description, which is dated July 1985, provides a description of the building and some of its features. In my opinion, its significance is largely due to its age, rather than its architectural or aesthetic appearance. Having said that, it is a building of some prominence and stature, because of its scale and its elevated position. Although other buildings are positioned in close proximity on one side, there is no built development on the side of the proposed appeal development. This undeveloped area forms part of the setting of the Listed Building and I consider that it makes a positive contribution to the significance of the heritage asset, as it reinforces the visual prominence and importance of the building.
8. Having said that, the appeal building would be positioned some 19m from the Listed Building and, when approaching the site from the driveway, the Listed Building would be visually framed by the appeal building and the existing buildings on the opposite side of the driveway. Although the proposed building would be taller than the buildings immediately opposite (i.e. on the other side of the drive), the Listed Building would be the central feature and it would remain the dominant and principal building on the site, both visually and in terms of its scale and stature. From further afield, including from the public footpath, the visual impact of the proposed building would not, in my opinion, be significant because of the distances involved between the footpath and the appeal site. Consequently, views of the Listed Building would not be impeded. Furthermore, the open aspect to the south and west of the Listed Building would be preserved.
9. Accordingly, I consider that the proposal would have a neutral effect on the setting and the significance of the Listed Building. Therefore, it would not

conflict with the relevant policies of the Development Plan or with the Framework, as referred to above.

Conditions

10. The Council has suggested conditions in the event of the appeal being allowed. These have been considered in the light of the advice contained within the Planning Practice Guidance. A condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the submitted plans is necessary for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.
11. To ensure a satisfactory appearance, a condition requiring the submission and prior approval of the external materials to be used in the construction of the proposed building is also necessary.
12. The Council has suggested that a condition should be imposed which restricts the use of the building to ancillary accommodation only. However, as planning permission would be required to use the building as a separate residential unit, I consider such a condition to be unnecessary.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, it is concluded that the appeal should be allowed.

Ian McHugh

INSPECTOR