
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 December 2019

by Peter Mark Sturgess BSc (Hons), MBA, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State.

Decision date: 7th January 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/G2815/D/19/3239270

Luddington Farm, Winwick Road, Thurning, Peterborough PE8 5BF

- 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 Harris against the decision of East Northamptonshire District Council.
 - The application Ref 19/01021/FUL, dated 7 June 2019, was refused by notice dated 6 August 2019.
 - The development proposed is a single storey timber orangery and porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission granted for a single-story timber orangery and a porch at Luddington Farm, Winwick Road, Thurning, Northamptonshire PE8 5BF in accordance with the terms of the application 19/01021/FUL, dated 7 June 2019, 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 plans submitted with the application: 11437/01, 11437/02, 11437/03, 11437/04 and 11437/05.
 3. The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be natural stone to match that used on existing dwelling, 'off white' painted timber for the frames to support the glazing of the orangery (including the parapet) and the porch. The tiles to be used on the roof of the porch shall be of the same type and colour of those used on the existing dwelling.

Preliminary Matters

2. I have used the address given on the application form, however access appears to be taken from Thurning Road. For the sake of consistency, I will use the details set out on the application form and decision notice in this decision.

Main Issue

3. The effect of the developments on the character and appearance of Luddington Farm (the dwelling).

Reasons

4. The dwelling is part of a group of 3 houses.
5. The houses are accessed via a long private drive. Part of the track is used as a public bridle way. There are views of the appeal site across a paddock from the bridle way, albeit it at a distance.
6. The house next door is known as Luddington Hall and has the appearance of a large, formal, country house set in substantial grounds.
7. Luddington Farm is set in substantial grounds that separate it from the other 2 houses. The approach to the dwelling from the north is informal: the rear, southern gardens, are more formal. There is a large multi-car garage standing away from the dwelling. The overall impression is of a substantial house standing in a large garden.
8. The principal matters at issue are: the effect of the orangery on the character and appearance of the dwelling by reason of its flat roof with a lantern, its parapet and its finished colour ('off-white'); and the effect of the porch on the character and appearance of the dwelling by reason of the shape of its roof, its harm to the linear plan form of the main dwelling and its finished colour ('off-white').
9. I take the view that there is a large dwelling on this site, and it is not unreasonable for an extension of the size and scale of the proposed orangery to be attached to it. Equally it is not unreasonable for a porch to be constructed outside an external door on the front elevation of the dwelling. Therefore, I agree with the proposals, orangery and porch, in principle, in the location shown on the application plans.
10. With regard to the details, my starting point is the existing dwelling, which despite exhibiting some features of a converted barn, has nonetheless, the appearance of a conventional dwelling house, with domestic paraphernalia in the garden, a large garage and a Juliet balcony on the south elevation. It is not an old or listed building, nor is it located in a conservation area. Views of the proposed orangery and porch are strictly limited, for the most part, to within the appellants' gardens.
11. The orangery would continue the existing linear form of the dwelling to the south. Its proposed colour would not detract from the character and appearance of the existing dwelling, as a colour such as 'off white' would lighten its appearance making it appear as a subordinate structure to the dwelling itself. Whereas dark stained timber, as used on the windows and doors of the existing dwelling, could result in an overly heavy appearance and emphasise its presence. The other features such as the flat roof with lantern and the parapet are features typical of such structures and would not appear discordant or incongruous in the circumstances. I see no reason to object to them as harming the character and appearance of the dwelling, as many dwellings have structures attached to them which display these features.
12. With regard to the porch, it is on the inside of an L shaped building and has no public visibility. It is on the front elevation of the dwelling, so that anyone approaching from this direction might be expecting to see a porch in this location. The pitch of its roof is similar to that of the main, east facing, gable and the swept back front pitch of its roof would hardly be noticeable from the

main (east) approach. As with the orangery, the use of 'off-white' colour will lighten its appearance. Its effect on the linear plan form of the dwelling would be minimal, as it projects 2m from one of the main flank walls of the dwelling, is 4.8m in overall area and is single storey. Therefore, the overall plan form of the dwelling will still be legible once the porch is constructed.

13. The development plan includes the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy adopted in July 2016 (NNJCS). Policy 8 seeks, amongst other things, to ensure high quality development. I see no conflict with the policies of the NNJCS, as it is intended to use high quality materials (timber, clay tiles and local stone) to match the existing dwelling. The proposals are also typical of the type of extensions that might be seen on dwellings across the area.
14. My attention has been drawn to the East Northamptonshire Council, 'Residential Extension and Alterations Design Guide' (READG). There is no overall conflict between the appeal proposals and the principles it sets out. I note that the READG accepts that materials, other than those used on the main property, may be acceptable for extensions, particularly where it is clearly designed to appear as a visually subordinate addition to the property, which the orangery and porch clearly are in this case.
15. Reference has been made to paragraphs 124 to 132 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 states the starting point for the consideration of development proposals is the development plan. The relevant policies with which the develop accords are consistent with the Framework.

Conclusion

16. Having regard to the development plan, when read as a whole, the appeal is allowed and planning permission granted, subject to the conditions set out in paragraph 1. I have imposed these conditions to comply with the relevant sections of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended), for the avoidance of doubt concerning the approved plans and to ensure that the development is completed in a manner sympathetic to the main dwelling house.

Peter Mark Sturgess

Inspector