



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 December 2023

by A. J. Boughton MA (IPSD) Dip.Arch. Dip.(Conservation) RIBA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2 February 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/F2415/D/23/3330926

Salisbury House Little End Bruntingthorpe Lutterworth LE17 5QJ

- 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 Richard Hammond against the decision of Harborough District Council.
 - The application Ref: 23/01012/FUL dated 11 July 2023 was refused by notice dated 22 September 2023.
 - The development proposed is Demolition of existing conservatory, erection of a first floor rear extension, erection of a detached garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to the proposed detached garage. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to works to the main dwelling house and planning permission is granted for Demolition of existing conservatory, erection of a first floor extension at Salisbury House Little End Bruntingthorpe Lutterworth LE17 5QJ in accordance with the terms of the application Ref: 23/01012/FUL dated 11 July 2023 and the plans submitted with it, so far as relevant to that part of the development hereby permitted, and 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: WA 626 (04) 07; WA 626 (04) 08; WA 626 (04) 09 A; WA 626 (04) 13.
 - 3) Except where samples or full manufacturers descriptions of such materials (including colour and texture) have been previously submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority, works shall be carried out using facing materials to walls, roof and fenestration which match, in terms of colour, texture and appearance, those used on the original property.
 - 4) Prior to the completion of the works hereby approved, a scheme of planting and landscaping, including front boundary treatment and hard surfacing, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The works shall be completed in accordance with the approved details within the first planting season following the occupation of the development hereby approved.

Preliminary Matter:

2. As the Council explain, the approach to the dwelling has changed since its original construction introducing potential for confusion as to what is being

considered. Although the proposal refers to an extension at the rear; in relation to the highway and approach from that, the most prominent elevation is that facing the road and the works proposed are to the 'side' or east-facing elevation. In the interests of certainty I have deleted the reference to 'rear' in the grant of permission.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site (Salisbury House) is a detached mid-twentieth two storey dwelling located within a small hamlet comprised of a mix of dwellings of recent date and older buildings including some that are listed. Salisbury House is well screened from other dwellings and does not fall within the setting of any listed building. Although it looks out onto open fields at the rear it is set within established trees and shrubbery such that, along with neighbouring dwellings, its built form together with that of most other nearby dwellings is discretely located within the Bruntlingthorpe Conservation Area (CA).
5. The Council refer to the effect of the proposal upon the CA, however no character assessment is provided. In that regard my observations are that the CA includes a wide range of building types including those of modest scale, layout and proportion supporting a generally rural character to the CA, but also a number which do not. The overarching character of the CA is that of informal groups of traditional buildings including conversions and more recent insertions which are both evocative of, but also in conflict with, such vernacular built form as is currently found; all within a well-treed setting.
6. The proposal would remove a prominent and somewhat incongruous conservatory structure on the most prominent (road-facing 'front') elevation of the appeal property and replace the garage structure attached to the east (side) elevation with (what would result in) a two-storey extension. Although this would change the streetscene from some viewpoints close to the appeal site, it would not be widely apparent nor, from my observations as to the character and appearance of this part of the CA and the significant screening of the site, would it be visually intrusive. The proposed replacement garage would be more prominent in the street scene being set away from the dwelling house close to the front boundary and, due to its non-vernacular form and material use, would present a degree of visual conflict with the prevailing character and appearance.
7. The Council comment as to design and concern as to the use of materials which differ from what is currently found and argue that the design would result in a 'different and harmful appearance'. Policy GD8(1)(a) of the Harborough Local Plan 2011-2031 (2019)(HLP) requires a high standard of design and that proposals should be inspired by, and respect local character and distinctiveness. At 1b), Policy GD8 also allows design responses, in appropriate situations, that are individual.
8. As the appellant observes, there is no singular, defining aesthetic in the locality. Given the era-specific design of the host dwelling, an extension such as is

proposed could not reasonably reflect ambitions towards implementing what might be assumed to be some sort of sympathetic local vernacular and still present as 'high quality design'. What is proposed I consider to be a well-considered and appropriate response to the challenge of extending this well-established dwelling. The resulting change to the overall character of the dwelling would be positive and¹, given its setting, I conclude what is proposed would cause no harm to the character and appearance of the CA, which would thereby be preserved.

9. On balance, as my reasons indicate, the works proposed to extend and alter Salisbury House would accord with Policies GD8 and HC1 of the HLP and therefore not conflict with the development plan taken as a whole, whereas the proposed garage would be unduly prominent due to its non-vernacular materials and form in proximity to the front boundary where it would appear to be visually separate from Salisbury House and seemingly introduce change harmful to the character and appearance of the CA. Consequently, taking all matters raised into account, the appeal succeeds in part subject to the usual timing and plans condition together with a materials condition to ensure, as far as possible, the works are carried out in a manner which is sympathetic to the character and appearance of the host dwelling. Having regard to the importance of screening and vegetation a condition securing the implementation of a suitable landscaping scheme is necessary and relevant to make the proposal acceptable.

Andrew Boughton

INSPECTOR

¹ Having regard to the duty set out in Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990