
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 February 2022

by R W Allen B.Sc (Hons) PGDip MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1 MARCH 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/M2840/W/21/3283329

26 High Street, Easton On The Hill, Stamford, PE9 3LN

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission under section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 for the development of land without complying with conditions subject to which a previous planning permission was granted.
 - The appeal is made by Mrs Beulah Killick against the decision of North Northamptonshire Council.
 - The application Ref NE/21/00588/VAR, dated 6 April 2021, was refused by notice dated 6 July 2021.
 - The application sought planning permission for alterations to and conversion of existing stone barn into residential annexe; re-roofing of a 'folly' without complying with a condition attached to planning permission Ref 20/01159/FUL dated 17 November 2020.
 - The condition in dispute is No 5 which states that: *The development the subject of this planning permission shall be carried out using external materials as detailed on the submitted application form, and plans received on 16.09.2020, to match those of the existing dwelling.*
 - The reason given for the condition is: *To achieve a satisfactory elevation appearance for the development.*
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether the deletion of the condition to permit alternative materials to be used on the roof structure of the barn would harm the appearance of the host property and preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Easton on the Hill Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The Council provides little evidence to define or characterise what it considers to be the significance of the conservation area. The appellant describes the village as "*being a typical Northamptonshire settlement with historic stone core interspersed and fringed with newer development...a delightful village [comprising] a warm limestone vernacular with a variety of roofing... contributing to the vernacular of the area.*" I observed nothing to disagree with the appellant's assessment, finding the irregular building plots and uniform building materials to be rich in interest and charming in character.
4. At the heart of the matter is the use of a particular roof tile, the Collyweston, on the appellant's barn, which sits within its rear garden and alongside the boundary with No.22 High Street (No.22). The Collyweston is undoubtedly extensively used in this village particularly on the main or principal buildings,

namely the main residences and the larger outbuildings, to the extent where it strongly and positively contributes to the character and appearance of the conservation area.

5. The appellant's barn was once fully clad with Collyweston but in undertaking the extant consent, the appellant states that only half of the said tiles were salvageable. Those deemed for re-use were cleaned and re-attached to the western roof slope, which is visible from the garden area and partially from the street. At the time of my site visit, the ridge tiles had not been fitted but I have no reason to doubt the appellant's intention to use Collyweston here. The eastern slope, on which can only be readily visible from No.22, is currently without tiles.
6. I sympathise with the appellant, in that at the time of the previous application, it had not been known that only half of the original Collyweston tiles were re-usable, and that replacing the unsalvageable tiles with new Collywestons are unpalatably costly and unviable. I equally appreciate that there is a real risk that without remedy, the barn could remain partially unroofed indefinitely which is not an ideal outcome for the appearance of the barn and would not serve the conservation area well. I have apportioned moderate weight to these circumstances.
7. However, I am not persuaded that the preferred alternative sought by the appellant, a blue/black slate tile, is an appropriate choice for this building. I note it has been used on other outbuildings in the vicinity including the one attached to the barn in question that sits within another property's curtilage. However, all examples that I saw of the blue/black slate were on smaller, perhaps less important outbuildings and not the principal buildings of the village. This perhaps explains why the appellant's 'Folly' building was permitted by the Council to be clad in a red roof tile. I thus draw little merit from this argument.
8. But, even if I were wrong in this observation, I am not persuaded that the use of two different roof tiles on the same building has been adequately justified in this instance, irrespective of the fact that only No.22 would readily see the blue/black slate. In my view, two different roof materials and to proportionately different styles would undermine the character of the barn. This would be notably apparent at the gabled ends, which are visible from both High Street and Garford Lane. Here, the two roof tile styles would be obviously disharmonious, because the Collyweston's rather jagged, uneven and thick edge would contrast unfavourably with the blue/black slate's clean, thin and even edges. No examples of other similar buildings in this area have been advanced to suggest such an approach has been successfully undertaken elsewhere.
9. Notwithstanding, I have considered whether I could amend the condition to require details of an alternative to be approved in writing by the Council. However, little evidence has been advanced to suggest that other and suitable alternatives are available and whether they would be acceptable to the Council. This includes the appellant's suggested use of "Mock Collywestons", of which I have no details of. For this reason, I cannot accordingly amend the condition.
10. I find that that the proposed use of the blue/black slate would undermine the character and appearance of the barn and in so doing, would not preserve the character or appearance of the conservation area. The proposed development

would amount to less than substantial harm for the purposes of paragraph 202 of the Framework¹. I do not find that the risk of the roof remaining partially tiled amounts to a public benefit; but would not in any event outweigh the identified harm.

11. The proposal would not accord with Local Plan² policy 2(a) and (b), which states that proposal should conserve and where possible enhance the heritage significance and setting and complement their surroundings. In reaching this conclusion, I have discharged my statutory duties under s72(1) of the 1990 Act.³

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

R W Allen

INSPECTOR

¹ The National Planning Policy Framework (July 2021)

² The North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy 2016

³ The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990