



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 June 2024

by Ian McHugh DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 July 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/M2840/D/24/3339782

12 Back Lane, Collyweston, Stamford, PE9 3PJ

- 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 Craig against the decision of North Northamptonshire Council.
 - The application Ref is NE/23/01330/FUL.
 - The development proposed is a single-storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the Collyweston Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a converted former agricultural building, which is situated on the edge of the CA. It is an 'L' shaped property constructed of local stone with a slate roof. In the vicinity of the site, the CA has a semi-rural character and the appeal property sits within a group of former farm buildings close to open countryside.
4. There has been some discussion between the parties regarding the precise status of the property, with the Council considering it to be a non-designated heritage asset. However, the appellant questions the reasoning behind this and whether the appropriate criteria have been considered when arriving at that view. I share the appellant's concerns on this matter. Notwithstanding, I consider that the building does have a distinctive character, because of its shape (comprising two rectangular sections), external materials and features, including the steps and door leading to the two-storey part of the building.
5. The proposal is a resubmission of a previous application (NE/23/00417/FUL), which was refused by the Council in November 2023. The appeal proposal is to construct a single-storey extension on the inside of the corner between the two main walls of the building. It would have a mono-pitched roof with external materials of stone, weatherboarding and slate. I am satisfied that the materials would be in keeping with the property.
6. The Council refers to Policies 2 and 8 of the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy and Policies EN11 and EN13 of the East Northamptonshire Local Plan 2023 in its decision notice. These policies generally seek (amongst other

things) for development to protect and enhance heritage assets; to respond to the site's context and local character; and to not detract from the character of existing buildings. I note that Policy EN13 relates specifically to non-designated heritage assets and because of my uncertainty over the non-designated heritage asset issue, I give this limited weight.

7. In reaching my decision, I have also considered the guidance contained in Historic England's Best Practice Guidelines – Adapting Traditional Farm Buildings 2017. I particularly note the advice, which, amongst other things, states that extensions should be subordinate and any that compromise the character of farm buildings should be avoided. Furthermore, the guidance given in the Council's Supplementary Planning Document – Householder Extensions is a consideration. This also advises that extensions should be subordinate in scale.
8. Irrespective of the building's designation, I have some concerns over of the proposal. I accept that the extension would not be visible from any public vantage points, due to its siting at the rear of the property. In that respect, I conclude that there would be no harm to the character or appearance of the CA.
9. I also agree with the appellant's argument that the extension would be subordinate in relation to the overall size of the existing property. However, in terms of its effect on the appearance of the building, the proposed extension would be a visually incongruous and disruptive element that would be at odds with the original simple rectangular form and shape of the two sections of the property.
10. Although I have no doubts that the building could be extended in other ways, I consider that the appeal proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the dwelling. It would, therefore, conflict with the Development Plan and the relevant guidance outlined above.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, it is concluded that the appeal be dismissed.

Ian McHugh

INSPECTOR