



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 November 2017

by Rory Cridland LLB (Hons), Solicitor

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

Decision date: 29th November 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Z2830/D/17/3179000

14 The Paddocks, Bugbrooke NN7 3QR

- 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 Mrs Linda Sgoluppi against the decision of South Northants District Council.
 - The application Ref S/2017/0401/FUL, dated 8 February 2017, was refused by notice dated 5 April 2017.
 - The development proposed is a two storey front extension to replace garage. First floor front and side extension. Balcony on west elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two-storey front extension to replace garage, a first floor front and side extension and a balcony on west elevation at 14 The Paddocks, Bugbrooke NN7 3QR in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref S/2017/0401/FUL, dated 8 February 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 Drawing Nos: 2016/37/100; 2016/37/110
 - 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 building.

Preliminary Matter

2. The description above has been taken from the Council's decision notice and the appellant has confirmed, as part of the appeal, that this change has been agreed. Accordingly, I have used the amended description above.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area and on the setting of nearby heritage assets.

Reasons

4. The appeal property consists of a two-storey detached dwelling situated at the end of a cul-de-sac and set back from the road. The surrounding area is characterised by properties of varying styles and sizes, a number of which are

set within large and spacious plots which positively contribute to the spacious and open character of the surroundings. To the west of the site is the Church of St Michael, a Grade II listed heritage asset located within the CA.

5. The proposed alterations would result in a significant addition to the existing property including a projecting front extension and first floor flat roof - both of which the Council's Design Guide¹ indicates are not generally acceptable. However, while I acknowledge that, in some cases, these features have the potential to negatively impact on their surroundings, the guidance set out in the SPG is only a starting point and it is necessary to consider the actual impact that these additions would have on the surrounding area and to then judge whether there is any material harm.
6. In view of the site's position at the end of the cul-de-sac and set back from the road, I do not consider the front extension itself would appear prominent in the general street scene. Furthermore, while I note the various concerns raised regarding the effect of the increase in bulk and scale on the character of the area, in view of the spacious surroundings, I am satisfied that the proposed alterations would not have any material impact. Moreover, while I agree with the Council's Design Guide regarding the potential impact that first floor flat roof extensions can have on the appearance of their surroundings, in this case the copper cladding will go some way to reducing the overall impact.
7. Overall, I do not consider the proposal would appear prominent in The Paddocks or would have any material impact on the character and appearance of the host wider residential area.
8. Turning then to its impact on nearby heritage assets, the proposal would result in some considerable changes in appearance along the western elevation. However, although there is some intervisibility between the appeal site and the setting of the nearby Grade II Listed Church of St Michael, there is a clear visual separation between the areas, with the residential premises having very little impact on the setting of the church and the CA.
9. Furthermore, I agree with the comments of the Council's heritage consultee who considers the significance of the church to be mostly derived from its age and survival. In view of its secluded position and walled grounds, the wider setting, including Millennium Green, makes little contribution towards the asset's overall significance. Even though its surroundings provide a tranquil setting, their contribution to the overall significance of the asset is limited. I do not, therefore, consider the significance of this important heritage asset would be affected. Accordingly, I find no harm in this respect.
10. Although the site falls outside the CA, the Council has also raised concerns with the impact on views towards the CA, in particular those along The Paddocks and towards the church. While I note that this is a pleasant view, it is nevertheless partially obscured by the large trees in the foreground. It adds little to the significance of the nearby heritage assets and I do not consider the limited impact on this view would justify withholding planning permission for the development proposed.
11. Consequently, I do not consider the proposal would negatively impact on the character and appearance of the surroundings area, the CA or nearby heritage

¹ South Northamptonshire Design Guide.

assets. As such, I find no conflict with Policies G3, H17, EV1, EV11 or EV12 of the South Northamptonshire Local Plan 1997 or with Policies SA or BN5 of the Joint Core Strategy (2014). These policies, taken together, seek to ensure that new development does not have a negative impact on the character and appearance of the surroundings area and seek to preserve or enhance the area's recognised heritage assets including their setting.

Other Matters

12. I have had regard to the concerns of local residents which were raised as part of the original application consultation. Those which relate to the impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding area, important local views and its effect on heritage assets have been taken into account in my reasoning above.
13. While I note the concerns raised in respect of the effect on outlook and light for occupants of other nearby premises, as well as those which relate to traffic and ground stability, the Council is satisfied any effects would not, in this instance, provide sufficient grounds for withholding permission for the development sought. I see no reason to conclude otherwise.

Planning Conditions

14. I have had regard to the various planning conditions suggested by the Council. In addition to the standard commencement condition, I agree that a condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans is appropriate in order to provide certainty. Likewise, I consider conditions requiring matching materials to be used in the construction of the extension to be appropriate in order to preserve the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
15. However, in the absence of any detailed reasons, I do not consider a condition in respect of the roof lights would be appropriate.

Conclusion

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

Rory Cridland

INSPECTOR