



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 May 2019

by R Bartlett PGDip URP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30th July 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/Z2830/D/19/3225525

1 Maltings Row, Deanshanger, MK19 6FA

- 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 and Mrs Anthony Moore against the decision of South Northamptonshire Council.
 - The application Ref S/2018/2896/FUL, dated 22 December 2018, was refused by notice dated 21 February 2019.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey rear extension at 1 Maltings Row, Deanshanger, MK19 6FA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref S/2018/2896/FUL, dated 22 December 2018, 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: Drawing Number 1841.01.
 - 3) The flue hereby approved shall be black and shall be retained as such.

Procedural Matters

2. The application form describes the proposed development as a single storey side extension whereas the decision notice and Part E of the Appeal Form describe it as a single storey rear extension. According to the appellants submissions there was no discussion or agreement regarding the amended description.
3. The dwelling is located on the corner of Maltings Row and High Street. The principal elevation, containing the front door and main windows, is that facing Maltings Row. I therefore agree that the proposed extension is to the rear of the property as is the existing garage. The main garden area is to the side of the house.
4. The appeal statement submitted on behalf of the appellants accepts that Council's amended description is correct. As no other party would be prejudiced by the change to the description, I have dealt with the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

5. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the development upon the character and appearance of the dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

6. The appeal site comprises a detached house, of traditional design, with a detached garage to the rear. It is located on a corner plot within a modern housing estate development. Between the rear of the house and the side of the garage there is a roughly triangular shaped area of yard, which due to its position to the north of the house is in the shade for much of the day.
7. The proposed development would make efficient use of this under-utilised area by extending the ground floor living accommodation to include a utility room and a larger dining area with bi-folding doors leading out onto the main garden area to the side of the house. A wood burning stove is also proposed to heat the increased space.
8. Due to the shape of the space between the house and garage, a pitched roof would not be practical. The land slopes upwards to the north and to the east of the site. As such adjacent properties and even the side garden to the appeal property are higher than the ground level of the proposed extension. In this particular case, the use of a flat roof is beneficial in terms of reducing the scale and visual impact of the proposed development. In fact the extension would be barely visible from anywhere outside of the appeal site. The existing boundary wall would screen the development from Maltings Row and from High Street there is only a very small gap between the house and the garage, which would enable a limited view of the proposal. The extension would be set back from the western sides of the house and garage and would be roughly the same height as the garage eaves, appearing, from High Street, as a simple boundary wall only seen when standing immediately opposite it.
9. The flue to the log burner would be discreetly located close up to the rear elevation of the house and would protrude only slightly above the eaves level. Given its size and location it would not be visually prominent in the street scene or from surrounding houses.
10. It is proposed to construct the extension in brickwork that would match the adjacent garage and the brick quoin detailing on the house. I observed during my site visit that there are properties elsewhere on the same estate, in far more visually prominent positions, whereby the main part of the dwelling is constructed in stone with brick quoins and rear elevations and/or rear projections and extensions are constructed in brickwork to match the quoins. The materials complement one another and add interest and variety to the street scene. The mix of materials in the area, make a positive contribution to its character and appearance.
11. The rear elevation faces the appellants garage and the side elevation of 63b High Street, which contains no windows. 3 Maltings Row also has a side elevation facing the site, containing a ground floor window, which is behind a 1.8m high fence. As such, the proposed development would not be unduly obtrusive when viewed from neighbouring properties.
12. For the above reasons the proposed development would respect the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and its immediate surroundings.

Accordingly I find no conflict with Policies G3(A), H17 and EV1 of the South Northamptonshire Local Plan (1997), which seek to ensure new development is compatible in terms of type, scale, siting, design and materials to the character of the area.

13. I also find no conflict with Policy SA of the West Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (2014), which sets out a presumption in favour of sustainable development, Policies SS2(c), SDP1 or SDP2 of the emerging South Northamptonshire Part 2 Local Plan, which seek good quality design or the South Northamptonshire Design Guide, which recognises that in some instances single storey flat roof extensions will be appropriate.

Conditions

14. Both parties have suggested conditions, which I have considered against the advice set out in Planning Practice Guidance. I have imposed the standard time limit condition together with a condition confirming the approved drawing number in the interests of certainty. As the materials and flue height are shown on the approved drawing number referred to in condition 2, further conditions on these matters are unnecessary. Any changes can be dealt with through the relevant minor amendment process. I agree that the flue should be finished in black to match the rainwater goods and a condition has been imposed to control this in the interests of visual amenity.

Conclusion

15. Taking all matters into consideration, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Rachael Bartlett

INSPECTOR