

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 November 2016

by Chris Couper BA (Hons) DiP TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 9 November 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/Y2810/D/16/3159909

19 Nether Lane, Flore NN7 4LR

- 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 Steve Simpson against the decision of Daventry District Council.
 - The application Ref DA/2016/0543, dated 1 June 2016, was refused by notice dated 2 August 2016.
 - The development proposed is a side ground and first floor extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property, the semi-detached pair and the area.

Reasons

3. The dwellings along this part of Nether Lane are set back from one side of the road, with countryside opposite. There is a mix of semi-detached and detached dwellings, with some variety in terms of their style and facing materials. However, viewed from the front the nearby dwellings generally have a relatively straightforward form, with simple gabled roofs which slope generally towards the road on the front elevation.
4. No. 19 Nether Lane ('No.19') forms one half of a semi-detached pair which is angled away from this sinuous road. Given the pair's broadly similar proportions and fenestration, their simple roof lines, and their brick facing materials, these two dwellings form a largely symmetrical pair. As their form and appearance is similar to the other semi-detached pairs along Nether Lane to the south-west these buildings comprise a fairly cohesive small group.
5. The proposal would include a forward-projecting two storey gable on the front elevation, whose first floor would be clad with weatherboard and would contain patio doors behind a metal balcony. In my view, that front projection would significantly alter the simple lines of this dwelling. Furthermore, when considered alongside its attached neighbour, the scheme would result in the building as a whole having a very diverse and complex form and appearance, and much of the existing symmetry and cohesion of the pair would be lost.

6. Although the proposed extension would be set well back from the road, and angled to it, the harm that that would cause to the host property and the pair would be apparent looking across the frontage of the large detached dwelling at no. 21 when approaching along Nether Lane from the east. The extension's significant width relative to the existing dwelling would exacerbate that harm. The scheme would also jar with the relatively simple form and consistent appearance of the remainder of the small group of semi-detached dwellings to the south-west.
7. The appellant has drawn my attention to a permitted development at no. 59 Sutton Street which I viewed on my visit. No. 59 is a semi-detached property which, unlike its attached neighbour, has a front-projecting gable. However, that extension has a simpler appearance than this scheme as it has no first floor patio doors or balcony, and is finished in broadly matching materials. It therefore appears less at odds with its attached neighbour than would be the case here. Given the very diverse form, style and appearance of other buildings in Sutton Street, that development's immediate context is also different to this proposal.
8. The appellant has stated that rather than facing the front elevation with weatherboard cladding he would be content with a condition requiring the scheme to be faced with matching materials. However, for the above reasons that would not overcome all the harm that I have found.
9. Amongst other matters, and in very general terms, policies GN2 (part A) and EN42 (parts A, B, and C) of the Saved Policies from the Daventry District Local Plan 2007, and policy S10 (part i) of the West Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy Local Plan (Part 1) 2014 state that development should normally be of a type, scale and design in keeping with the locality, should reinforce local distinctiveness, and should blend with or enhance its surroundings. The scheme would not satisfy those development plan requirements, or the National Planning Policy Framework's objectives at paragraphs 58, 60 and 64 for development to respond to local character and promote or reinforce local distinctiveness.
10. The Parish Council raised no objection to the proposal, and there were no representations from neighbouring residents. However, having considered the scheme on its merits I have found that it would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the host property, the semi-detached pair and the area, and would conflict with the requirements of the development plan. Although the proposal would provide enlarged family accommodation, I am not satisfied that this scheme is the only way in which that objective could be met. For those reasons, and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

Chris Couper

INSPECTOR