
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 December 2016

by Andrew Owen BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

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

Decision date: 04 January 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Z2830/D/16/3161141
28 Stuart Road, Brackley NN13 6HZ

- 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 Mrs K Clough against the decision of South Northants District Council.
 - The application Ref S/2016/1562/FUL, dated 19 June 2016, was refused by notice dated 19 August 2016.
 - The development proposed is a first floor side extension with other associated internal and external works.
-

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 area.

Reasons

3. The existing property is sited in a small cul-de-sac of seven detached houses. Although these dwellings differ in their finishing materials and design features, they can generally be categorised as either being wide buildings with integral garages or narrower houses with attached, pitched roof garages. Indeed along Stuart Road, in proximity of the site, the dwellings generally fall into either of these groups.
4. The proposed extension would be above the existing garage. It would be flush with the front elevation of the main house and would continue the same ridge line as that over the house. The neighbouring property at No 30 has an extension above its garage close to their common boundary, but this is set back from the front elevation of the house, and the ridge height is lower than that of the main house. Planning permission has already been granted¹ at the appeal site for an extension similar to that at No 30 in respect of its set back from the front elevation and reduced ridge height from the main dwelling.
5. The Council's Residential Extensions Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG), advises that side extensions should be set back from the front elevation of the

¹ Ref No S/2016/0894/FUL

- main house and have lower eaves and ridge heights to ensure the original house remains dominant and so that symmetry is retained.
6. My attention has been drawn to a number of other properties in the vicinity which have had extensions built, similar to that proposed, which maintain the same height and building line as the original house. As such, the proposal would not be unfamiliar in the area and indeed the resultant dwelling would be similar in appearance to those wider properties in the area with integral garages. Consequently I do not consider the extension would be prominent.
 7. However the immediate context of the appeal site differs from these other examples as Nos 28 and No 30 are seen as a pair of houses slightly separate from the neighbouring properties. This separation creates a strong relationship between the two units. By not being set back or set down from the main house, the proposal would contrast with the design of the adjacent extension at No 30 which would result in this pair of units having an unsymmetrical appearance.
 8. I accept there is no symmetry at present as the extension at No 30 has resulted in the two properties having distinctly different appearances. Indeed, such a relationship, where a wider house and a narrower house are adjacent to each other, is common in the area. However, the proposal would result in the two properties appearing very similar in most respects but with slightly different first floor extensions sitting side by side. This contrast in the design of the extensions would appear jarring, particularly because of the strong relationship of the two houses with each other and the proximity of the extensions to each other. As a result the development would detract from the appearance of the pair of houses in the street scene and so would harm the character and appearance of the area.
 9. I note the appellant's comments that the extension would provide a more useable layout than the extension already granted planning permission. Notwithstanding the fact that I have not been provided with a copy of the plans relating to this previous permission, this issue would not be likely to justify the harm the development would cause to the visual relationship with No 30.
 10. Consequently I consider the development would conflict with Policy G3 of the South Northamptonshire Local Plan (SNLP) which requires all development to be compatible with the existing character of the locality, Policy H17 of the SNLP which advises extensions should respect the character of neighbouring development, and Policy EV1 of the SNLP which, among other things, expects development to have regard to the relationship with adjoining buildings. The proposal would also fail to accord with the advice in the SPG as set out above, and would contrast with the aims of the National Planning Policy Framework and Policy SA of the West Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy which both support sustainable development through improving environmental conditions.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, and taking account of all other considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Andrew Owen

INSPECTOR