



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 4 May 2022

by William Cooper BA (Hons) MA CMLI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9th May 2022

Appeal A: APP/L2820/W/21/3274084

45 Pipe Lane, Warkton, Kettering NN16 9XJ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Ben Murphy against the decision of Kettering Borough Council.
 - The application Ref: KET/2020/0813, dated 23 November 2020, was refused by notice dated 11 February 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as first floor rear extension (room in roof) and single storey side extension.
-

Appeal B: APP/L2820/Y/21/3274086

45 Pipe Lane, Warkton, Kettering NN16 9XJ

- The appeal is made under section 20 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 against a refusal to grant listed building consent.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Ben Murphy against the decision of Kettering Borough Council.
 - The application Ref: KET/2020/0814, dated 23 November 2020, was refused by notice dated 11 February 2021.
 - The works proposed are described as a first floor rear extension (room in roof) and single storey side extension.
-

Decision

Appeal A

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a first floor rear extension (room in roof) and single storey side extension at 45 Pipe Lane, Warkton, Kettering NN16 9XJ in accordance with the terms of the application Ref: KET/2020/0813, dated 23 November 2020, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the conditions on the attached Schedule A.

Appeal B

2. The appeal is allowed and listed building consent is granted for a first floor rear extension (room in roof) and single storey side extension at 45 Pipe Lane, Warkton, Kettering NN16 9XJ in accordance with the terms of the application Ref: KET/2020/0814, dated 23 November 2020, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the conditions on the attached Schedule B.

Preliminary Matters

3. As the proposal relates to a listed building and is in a conservation area, I have had special regard to sections 16(2), 66(1) and 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act).

4. Since the Council's decision, a new version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published in July 2021. Also, the new Kettering Site Specific Part 2 Local Plan (LP) has been adopted as part of the development plan in December 2021. The parties have had opportunity to comment on the engagement of these new policy documents in relation to the appeals, and so will not be disadvantaged by my consideration of them.
5. The appeal site is located within the Warkton Conservation Area (CA). Given the proposed extensions' location to the rear of the appeal building and consequent lack of prominence to the wider CA, the Council considers that the proposal would preserve the character and appearance of the CA¹, which I accept.

Main Issue

6. The main issue is whether the proposal would preserve the Grade II listed building, 45 Pipe Lane (Ref: 1052007), or any features of special architectural or historic interest that it possesses.

Reasons

7. The listed building is located within the historic estate village of Warkton. It faces towards a stretch of Pipe Lane that is close to the junction with Church Street, which is at the heart of the CA. The locality is characterised by typically limestone walled cottages. Thatched cottage roofs are a distinctive, eye-catching architectural element in the neighbourhood, albeit with some variety of slate, stone or red tile roofing materials also evident on some dwellings.
8. The listed building comprises a main core of a two-storey detached cottage that dates from the eighteenth century. It has coursed limestone rubble and ironstone walls, and a thatched roof. The authoritative front elevation of the listed building, facing toward Pipe Lane and the centre of the CA, has a strongly charismatic rustic estate cottage architectural style, with its limestone walls and uninterrupted stretch of thatched roof.
9. The rear of the listed cottage has a more evolved character. Here are an eyebrow dormer with later twentieth century brickwork, and a single storey kitchen extension with a mix of red brick and limestone walls and red tile roof. These rear elements have been added between the late nineteenth and early to mid-twentieth century. The building's part-stone and part-red brick walled western gable lean-to and timber boarded outbuildings further add to the evolved architectural variety that is noticeable viewed from the back garden of the listed cottage.
10. The listed building embodies evidential, historical and aesthetic values, which contributes to the building's special interest. Given the above, I consider the special interest of the listed building, insofar as it relates to these appeals, to be primarily associated with the historic legibility of its eighteenth century, estate village cottage architecture.
11. The proposal would add the following mass at the rear of the cottage. A weatherboarded family room with black framed bifold doors would join to the ground floor extension. Also, at first floor level, a shower room and additional

¹ As set out in Section 8.0, paragraph 2 of the Planning Officer's Report.

bedroom would be added, with heightened roof mass including a new east-facing dual pitched dormer. As such, the bulk, height, complexity and modernity of the rear wing would increase. Also, the heightened and enlarged tiled extension roof would entail removal of part of the rear thatch of the main cottage core, and cut into the evolved rear eyebrow dormer.

12. That said, the enlarged eastern elevation of the building's rear extension would result in a more visually harmonious ratio of exterior wall surface to its roof and window expanse than the existing kitchen extension. Also, the reduction of the width of the rear eyebrow dormer would simplify its fenestration. These factors would to some extent lessen visual distraction by existing evolved rear architectural elements from the building's core eighteenth century architecture. Also, the ridge height of the proposed first floor extension would be subordinate to that of the main body of the cottage. Together, these factors would help the proposal to assimilate with the evolved rear character of the building.
13. Furthermore, the single storey weatherboarded family room extension to the evolved kitchen extension would read as an architecturally 'honest' addition that would be of sufficiently modest proportion and discreet location to be acceptably subordinate to the listed building, such that the predominance of its limestone and thatch architecture would legibly endure.
14. The portions of rear thatch and eyebrow dormer to be removed are substantially more modern than the eighteenth century fabric of the cottage core. Also, intervening vegetation including evergreen trees in the cottage garden, together with other buildings, outbuildings, fences and walls in the locality would minimise the prominence of the appeal scheme from Pipe Lane. Furthermore, the distinctive architectural authority of the front elevation of the main body of the listed building, with its charismatic historic cottage style, would endure.
15. Consequently, the legibility of the listed building's eighteenth century, estate village cottage architecture would endure.
16. Given the above, I conclude that the proposal would preserve the special interest of the Grade II listed building. This would satisfy the requirements of the Act and the Framework.
17. While the proposal would not meet the part of criterion b of Design Principles Policy WAR1 of the LP that requires development in Warkton to be constructed predominantly of local limestone and thatch, this is tempered by a) my agreement with the Council's view that the proposal would preserve the character and appearance of the CA, and my findings that b) having regard to individual site specific factors, the predominance of the listed building's limestone and thatch architecture would endure, and c) the proposal would preserve the special interest of the Grade II listed building.
18. As such, the proposal would accord with the more dominant policy relating to the main issue in this case, which is Policy 2 of the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy 2011-2031. This seeks to ensure that proposals conserve designated heritage assets and the historic environment. Therefore, and while of limited relevance to the appeal made under section 20 of the Act, the proposal would also adhere to the development plan as a whole.

Conditions

Appeal A

19. In addition to the standard time limit condition, a condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the submitted details is necessary to ensure that they are implemented as approved.

Appeal B

20. In addition to the standard time limit condition, a condition requiring the works to be carried out in accordance with the submitted details is necessary to ensure that they are implemented as approved.

Conclusion

21. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeals should be allowed.

William Cooper

INSPECTOR

Schedule A) Conditions for Appeal A

- 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: 20-075-01 Existing & Proposed Elevations, Existing & Proposed Floor Plans, Existing & Proposed Sections; 20-075-02 Proposed Site Plan Location Plan.

Schedule B) Conditions for Appeal B

- 1) The works hereby consented shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
- 2) The works hereby consented relate solely to the plans, drawings, notes and written details submitted with the application, or as subsequently amended and approved in writing by the following conditions.