



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 October 2017

**by Chris Forrett BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

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

**Decision date: 27<sup>th</sup> October 2017**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/Z2830/D/17/3181010**

**Ebenezer House, Middle Street, Upper Heyford, Northamptonshire NN7 3LX**

- 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 & Mrs Barrie Jones against the decision of South Northamptonshire District Council.
  - The application Ref S/2017/0819/FUL, dated 27 March 2017, was refused by notice dated 22 May 2017.
  - The development proposed is a two storey first floor front extension to provide extra living accommodation.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two storey first floor front extension to provide extra living accommodation at Ebenezer House, Middle Street, Upper Heyford, Northamptonshire NN7 3LX in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref S/2017/0819/FUL, dated 27 March 2017, 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: 22010-(S)-01 and 22010-(L)01.
  - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.

### Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

### Reasons

3. The appeal site is located off a driveway to Dovecote Farm from Middle Street. The site is rural in character with a small cluster of residential properties and farm buildings including modern and traditional style buildings in the vicinity of the site.
4. The appeal building itself has a simple linear form to it, and from the Appellants photos the front of which is of brick construction which has subsequently been rendered. However, the gable wall on the south-west elevation is constructed

- on stonework, and there is a single storey stone extension on the north-east side of the dwelling and some stonework to the front canopy.
5. The Council have stated that the building is constructed from ironstone and have referred to the Supplementary Planning Guidance on Residential Extensions (SPG) which includes advice on extensions to traditional stone buildings. The SPG indicates that forward additions are generally inappropriate as the effect of such extensions would conflict with the simple form and appearance of the building and its character.
  6. However, from the evidence before me, large parts of the dwelling are constructed from brickwork, which have been subsequently rendered. As such the building does not exhibit a strong stone character, despite the southern gable and other stone parts to the building. To my mind, this significantly diminishes the historical nature of the building.
  7. The proposal would involve a two storey front extension with a small gable wall facing the street. It would project in the region of 3.3 metres from the main front wall of the host dwelling and would be rendered to match the publically visible parts of the dwelling.
  8. Given the set back from the road, this front gable would not be especially prominent in the streetscene. I am also mindful of the two modern properties to the north of the appeal dwelling both of which have large gable walls facing the street.
  9. Taking all of these factors into account, and that the overriding stone character of the host dwelling has already been lost, I find that the proposed extension would not harm the existing character of the host dwelling nor the wider area. In coming to that view I acknowledge that it would result in a 'T' shaped building form, but I consider that this would not result in any material harm to the character and appearance of the area.
  10. The appeal development would be located near to Dovecote Farm which is a Grade II Listed Building. Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires me to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the setting of this building. In this case, I agree with the Council that the development would not have an adverse impact on the setting of this building. Therefore, I find that the proposal would accord with the conservation aims of the Framework.
  11. For the above reasons the development would not harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling or the wider rural area and would accord with saved Policies G3, H17 and EV1 of the South Northamptonshire Local Plan (1997), Policy SA of the West Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (2014) which amongst other matters seek to ensure that the presumption in favour of sustainable development is applied and that development is compatible in terms of type, scale, siting, massing, design and material of the existing character of the existing dwelling and the locality. It would also accord with the design aims of the National Planning Policy Framework.

#### *Other matters*

12. Concern has also been raised over the loss of land for the parking of vehicles, the over development of the site, and matters relating to the construction of the development.

13. In respect of available parking space, from what I observed at my site visit, there would be sufficient space remaining, including the land to the south of the dwelling, for the parking of vehicles. In relation to concerns raised in relation to construction matters, this is not a significant planning matter, and would in any case not be a reason to withhold planning permission.
14. Finally, in relation to the potential overdevelopment of the site, the proposal is not excessive and would leave sufficient space for all the normal activities and requirements one would normally expect at the frontage to a residential property.

### **Conditions**

15. Other than the standard time limit condition, it is necessary to ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans for the reason of certainty. I have also attached a condition relating to the use of the matching materials in the interests of the character and appearance of the area.

### **Conclusion**

16. Taking all matters into consideration, for the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

*Chris Forrett*

INSPECTOR