



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 December 2024

by **Andrew Dale BA (Hons) MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 December 2024

Appeal Ref. APP/M2840/D/24/3347673

2 Howards Meadow, King's Cliffe, Peterborough PE8 6YJ

- 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 Jill Anne Hamilton against the decision of North Northamptonshire Council.
 - The application ref. is NE/24/00241/FUL.
 - The development proposed is: "Two storey side extension".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a 2-storey side extension at 2 Howards Meadow, King's Cliffe, Peterborough PE8 6YJ in accordance with the terms of the application, ref. NE/24/00241/FUL, 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 numbered: 23.073 - SZ – 100 Rev A; and 23.073 - SZ – 300 Rev A.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those of the existing building.

Preliminary matters

2. A revised National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) was published on 12 December 2024. The substantive parts of the new 2024 version do not however differ from the previous version insofar as they relate to the main issue in this appeal. The cases of the main parties will not therefore be prejudiced by my reference to the new version. I have proceeded on this basis.
 3. Notwithstanding the proposal's description in the heading and decision above, which is taken from the application form and the decision notice, the submitted plans show that the proposed 2-storey side extension would include a small single-storey side projection and a glazed, timber-framed corridor link to the rear. Like the Council, I have taken these into account and noted that the previously approved alterations are also shown on the plans.
-

Main issue

4. The Council's decision notice has 2 reasons for refusal, but there is a degree of overlap between them. The considerations relating to visual impact, design and heritage can be gathered under one main issue, that being the effect of the proposed extension upon the character and appearance of the dwelling and the surroundings, including the extent to which it would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the King's Cliffe Conservation Area (KCCA).

Reasons

5. The KCCA encompasses the historic core of King's Cliffe and is characterised by buildings of local stone positioned prominently along the streets at the back of the footways or even, in some cases, on the edges of the carriageways. The appeal dwelling, a detached 2-storey house built in 1994, follows this locally distinctive layout in the way it addresses Park Street. Situated on a corner plot, it also has a return frontage to Howards Meadow, a cul-de-sac.
6. It is proposed to add a 2-storey side extension about 4.8m wide, with an additional single-storey element about 1.3m wide, to the eastern flank of the house. The main extension would be set back 0.9m from the existing front wall, with the single-storey projection being set back over 2m from the front of that main extension. The scheme would be designed to respond to the front corner of the side garden, rather than being obviously contrived for any reason.
7. I consider that the proposed side extension would be sufficiently aligned with the guidance in the Householder Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), adopted in June 2020, for such side extensions to be set back 0.9m from the front elevation of the house, set down slightly from the main ridge and be no wider than half the width of the original front wall.
8. The Council queries the width by implying that the existing side entrance porch should not be considered given the degree to which it is set back from Park Street. By that same logic, the proposed single-storey projection should not be taken into account. In any event, it seems to me that most observers would form a visual impression from how the main 2-storey part of the extension fits in with the 2-storey house. It would be no wider than half the width of the original 2-storey front wall. The scale and form of the original dwelling would remain legible. The development would appear sufficiently subservient to the existing building, when viewed as a whole, in terms of scale.
9. The amenity space that would be taken up is tucked in a corner, shaded by planting and has no direct access from a ground floor door in the eastern gable end. Ample outside amenity space to the rear of the dwelling would remain available, taking into account the previously permitted extensions. The plot would not appear overdeveloped or unduly cramped in itself or in comparison to its partner property on the other side of the junction at 1 Howards Meadow.
10. The small section of boundary walling that would be removed is not of great importance to the overall quality of the street scene, in part because it is largely disguised by planting. The extension would provide a harder built-up edge to Park Street and Howards Meadow in its place but, importantly, such a layout would be

redolent of the KCCA as whole. The asymmetrical relationship between nos 1 and 2 would endure, with no. 2 being brought closer to Howards Meadow than no. 1. There would no serious closure of the vista down Howards Meadow from the junction since there is already a dense band of planting along the site's boundary with this road some of which would be retained. In any event, this is not a key view within the KCCA since Howards Meadow, a short distance beyond no. 2, follows a suburban cul-de-sac layout and is not included in the KCCA.

11. I consider overall that the proposed extension would be sufficiently complementary to the parent building in terms of its scale, massing and design including materials, roof profile and the style, detailing and proportions of the windows. Rather than having a dominating impact on the surroundings, it would make a visually positive contribution to its context and location and be respectful of the character and appearance of the KCCA.
12. I conclude on the main issue that the proposed extension would preserve the character and appearance of the dwelling, the surroundings and the KCCA. It would display the design quality and the respect for local character and the historic environment that are required by Policies 2 and 8 of the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy 2011-2031, adopted in July 2016 (JCS), Policies EN11 and EN12 of the East Northamptonshire Local Plan Part 2, adopted in October 2023 and Policies BE1 and BE2 of the King's Cliffe Neighbourhood Development Plan, made in October 2019. These policies are consistent with the Framework's objectives for achieving well-designed places and conserving and enhancing the historic environment.

Other matters

13. Some confusion arises as the Delegated Report (DR) refers to less than substantial harm to the setting of surrounding listed buildings and appears to introduce another potential reason for refusal relating to highway safety concerns stemming from the proximity of the resulting building to the highway. It is important to note that neither of those matters found their way into the decision notice which must represent the final settled view of the Council.
14. The closest listed buildings at 64A (Rosary Barn) and 64 (Rosary Farmhouse) Park Street lie to the west of the appeal dwelling. Their setting would not be disturbed in any way by the well-designed appeal extension on the eastern flank of 2 Howards Meadow.
15. The DR turns the standing advice from the local highway authority (LHA) on building in proximity to a highway into a potential reason for refusal. The LHA did not formally recommend refusal. The extent of the adopted highway hereabouts is not clear. The extension would take place within the site boundary of the appeal property. At 2 of its corners it would abut what appears to be the back of a footway in very much the same way as the existing front elevation facing Park Street more obviously does. At both points there would still be a gap of 1m or so from the actual carriageway edge. The appellant may be advised to contact the LHA before proceeding with the works if any adopted highway boundary at this junction includes the strip of land curving into Howards Meadow that seems to function as a footway, but in planning terms there is no basis for a refusal on the grounds that the scheme would prejudice highway safety in conflict with JCS Policy 8 b)i.

Conditions

16. I have reviewed the 3 conditions suggested by the local planning authority in its questionnaire. I shall impose conditions setting the standard time period in which the development is to commence and requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the relevant approved drawings to provide certainty. A condition is also necessary to secure the use of external materials that match those of the existing building so that the development respects the character and appearance of the dwelling and the KCCA.

Conclusion

17. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, the lack of objections from local residents and the support from the Parish Council, I conclude that this appeal should be allowed.

Andrew Dale

INSPECTOR