



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 June 2020

by Ben Plenty BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6 July 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/H2835/D/20/3247515

11 Duck End, Wollaston, Wellingborough NN29 7SH

- 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 J Taylor against the decision of Borough Council of Wellingborough.
 - The application Ref WP/19/00498/FUL, dated 14 August 2019, was refused by notice dated 21 January 2020.
 - The development proposed is for a first-floor extension and single storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for a first-floor extension and single-storey side extension at 11 Duck End, Wollaston, Wellingborough NN29 7SH, in accordance with the terms of application WP/19/00498/FUL, dated 14 August 2019, and subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin no 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: Location plan 1118-MBA-XX-00-DR-A-00000-SO-03, Proposed elevations 1118-MBA-V1-XX-DR-A-30000-SO-07, Proposed first-floor plan 1118-MBA-V1-01-DR-A-10111-SO-010, Site section 1118-MBA-XX-XX-DR-A-20000-SO-02, Proposed section BB 1118-MBA-V1-XX-DR-A-20001-SO-03, Proposed section CC 1118-MBA-V1-XX-DR-A-20002-SO-04, Proposed section (AA) 1118-MBA-V1-XX-DR-A-20000-SO-05, Proposed site plan 1118-MBA-XX-00-DR-A-10001-SO-06, Proposed site streetscene 1118-MBA-XX-XX-DR-A-30000-SO-04, Proposed roof plan 1118-MBA-V1-RP-DR-A-10112-SO-06 and Proposed ground floor plan 1118-MBA-V1-GF-DR-A-10110-SO-05.
 - 3) No development shall commence until samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extensions hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved samples.
 - 4) Details of the type of obscure glazing to be installed in the bathroom window on the side elevation shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. No part of that window, that is less than 1.7 metres above the floor of the room in which it is installed, shall be capable of being opened. The approved type of obscured glazing

shall be installed prior to the first use of the first floor and shall be retained thereafter.

Procedural matter

2. The appellants state, at section E of the appeal form, that the description of development has not changed. However, despite this they have then quoted the revised description used by the Council in its decision notice. As I have not seen confirmation that the description was agreed to be changed, I have used the original text which adequately describes the proposal.
3. The planning application was amended following its submission to the Council but prior to determination. I have dealt with the appeal on the basis of the amended plans, which do not materially change the substance of the proposal and would not prejudice any party.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are:
 - The effect of the proposed extensions on the character and appearance of the street scene, and
 - The effect of the proposal on the living conditions of occupiers of 6 Bramley Court (No 6) with particular respect to outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

5. The street includes a range of various house types and styles. Due to this there is no clearly defined building line. Local historic buildings are generally close to the footway with more modern development being largely set further back. Consequently, dwellings such as 19-23 and 16-12 Duck End are prominent features in the public realm. Beyond the appeal site the highway becomes a relatively narrow lane as it climbs the hill. The appeal dwelling is viewed as an end property on the south side of the street, due to landscape screening beyond. The appeal property is a simple single-storey design and is mostly set behind a tall hedge. It is also on land that is higher than the highway. Nevertheless, it is shorter than the neighbouring two-storey dwelling to the west. The appeal dwelling therefore makes a subdued contribution to the street. Accordingly, the site conveys a neutral contribution to the character and appearance of the area.
6. The proposal would adapt the appeal dwelling into a two-level building. The roof would be raised with the majority of accommodation provided within a pitched roof-space. This method of extension would be a coherent and sensitive approach to the site. Therefore, although the dwelling would become a comparatively tall building, its profile would follow the natural topography of the surrounding land. Consequently, it would be an appropriate addition in this context. This would subsequently accord with National Design Guidance that requires development to integrate well with its surroundings. The proposal would therefore not be over-dominant or out of proportion with the surrounding streetscene. Furthermore, the Council's minor concern in regard to the proposed use of a mix of contemporary and traditional materials can be suitably addressed through the imposition of a planning condition.

7. The proposal would result in the increase of height of the dwelling by raising both the existing ridge and eaves of the roof. The form would therefore consist of both pitched roofs and a small flat roof element to the rear of the extended roof. Consequently, the design would be a considered addition that would extend the existing form in a complementary manner. A key view of the site is from the junction of Little Lane with Duck End. From here, the view of the appeal dwelling would principally consist of pitched roofs. This vantage would illustrate a sympathetic and measured addition to the street.
8. The site is within the Wollaston Conservation Area (CA). The statutory requirements¹ entail that special attention be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character and appearance of the CA. The significance of the CA principally derives from the importance and arrangement of historic buildings around St Mary's Church, Wollaston Hall and the historic core of the village. I concur with the Appellant's heritage Statement that the significance of the site within the conservation area has been affected by local modern development. Therefore, in finding that the proposal would be a sympathetic addition to the streetscene, it is further found that it would preserve the CA.
9. The appeal site is close to several listed buildings. These include 16 Duck End (No 16) and 17-23 Duck End (No's 17-23). I have a statutory duty² to have special regard to the desirability to preserve the setting of a listed building. Opposite the site, No 16 is a thatched roof, two-storey dwelling. Its significance derives from its mid C18 origins and its architectural interest. The appeal dwelling is set away from the listed building, on higher land and behind landscaping. This creates a functional separation between the two buildings and would result in limited change to the setting of the listed building.
10. No's 17-23 consist of a terraced row of three dwellings of one and two stories that originate from the mid and late C17. Its significance derives from its age and architectural interest within the village setting. A key view of this building is from the junction of Duck End and Little Lane. From this vantage the appeal site is set slightly apart from the listed building. It is also separated by distance, elevation and intervening boundary features. Accordingly, the effect on the significance of the adjacent listed buildings from key views would be preserved.
11. Therefore, taking all of the above into account, the form and scale of the proposed extensions would be in keeping with the character and appearance of the street scene.
12. Accordingly, the proposal would accord with policy 8 (d)(i) and (ii) of the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy 2011-2031 (2016) (CS). These seek development that responds to a site's context and topography. Furthermore, the proposal would satisfy the National Planning Policy Framework (The Framework) which seeks development to be sympathetic to the local character.

Living conditions

13. The appeal site is adjacent to the rear garden of No 6. This dwelling is single-storey and set in a relatively spacious plot. The rear outlook from the dwelling consists of a comparatively wide and deep rear garden. Furthermore, the rear

¹ Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

² section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

garden is on a gradient that slopes down to its rear boundary. Consequently, the floor level of the dwelling of No 6 is higher in comparison to the appeal dwelling beyond. Over the rear boundary, the view includes the gable end of the appeal dwelling and views over its flat roof rear extension.

14. Consequently, the view from the rear windows and garden of No 6 would be altered by the proposal. However, its rear garden is a sizeable area and there is a substantial distance from its rear elevation to the rear boundary. Furthermore, as the garden slopes downhill the appeal dwelling is significantly lower than the rear windows of No 6. This would limit and reduce the visual effect of the proposal. Moreover, although the proposal would increase the scale of the dwelling, it would be partially screened by existing boundary planting further diminishing its effect. Some screening would be lessened in winter months through leaf loss. However, the overall effect of the proposal would be limited when considered in context with the existing built form. Therefore, taking these elements together the effect of the proposal on the outlook of No 6 would be negligible.
15. Accordingly, the proposal would satisfy policy 8 (e)(i) of the CS which seeks development to protect amenity of neighbouring properties. The proposal would also accord with the Framework that requires development to create places which promote health and wellbeing with a high standard of amenity for new and existing users.

Other matters

16. In regard to loss of daylight and sunlight, the proposal is to the west of No 6 and therefore could partially affect sunlight at the end of the day. However, this would only result in a minimal loss of light for latter part of a day. In terms of the effect on daylight, due to the separation distance and level change the proposal would have a negligible effect on daylight to the garden and rear windows of No 6.
17. Concerning the effect on the privacy of nearby dwellings, the proposal would result in the addition of two side windows at first floor that would face the rear elevation of No 6. One would be obscurely glazed and serve a bathroom. The second window would be high-level with a windowsill height of 1.7 metres and serve a bedroom. Hence, no overlooking would occur towards the rear of No 6. Also, rear facing windows of the proposal would look towards 5 Bramley Court and the rear gardens of Abbey Court. However, the appeal dwelling has a rear garden that significantly rises due to the topography of the site and includes a substantial rear hedge. This would significantly reduce overlooking capability. Furthermore, the separation distance and the garage of No 6, would further reduce the scope for overlooking. Also, a side window of bedroom 3 would look towards 15 Duck End. Nevertheless, the view to its rear would be largely obscured by the neighbouring dwelling. This would therefore principally only provide views of the highway. Subsequently, no substantive overlooking would occur towards nearby dwellings as a result of the proposal.
18. The effect of the proposal on the outlook of nearby neighbouring dwellings would also be limited due to the separation distance, level changes and intervening landscaping.
19. There are two trees, within the rear garden of No 6 that partly over sail the roof of the appeal dwelling. The adjacent ash tree will require some crown

lifting to facilitate development. The Council's arborist has raised no objection to this work as it would not cause serious damage to the tree. I see no reason in the submitted evidence to disagree with these findings. Therefore, I find that alterations to the tree would be acceptable and not create a harmful imbalance to its canopy.

20. Wollaston Neighbourhood plan (made 2016) identifies a need for new dwellings that are small and prioritise the provision of bungalows. However, this requirement is not a specific policy objective of the Plan and in any event relates to the provision of new dwellings. Moreover, the proposal would have only a minimal impact on the amount of single-storey housing stock within the settlement.

Conditions

21. I have considered the use of conditions in line with the Government's Planning Practice Guidance (PPG). The PPG identifies that planning conditions can enable development to proceed where it would otherwise have been necessary to refuse planning permission³. I have attached the standard conditions required by the regulations in regard to timeframe and approved plans. I have also attached a condition requiring materials to be agreed by the Council in the interests of the character and appearance of the area. Additionally, I have included a condition requiring the bathroom window to be obscurely glazed as annotated on the elevation plan. This was not suggested by the Council but is necessary to maintain the privacy of occupiers of No 6.

Conclusion

22. For the above reasons, the appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted.

Ben Plenty

INSPECTOR

³ Planning Policy Guidance: 001 Reference ID: 21a-001-20140306