

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 January 2017

by D J Barnes MBA BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 12th January 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/V2825/D/16/3163085
26 Thornton Road, Northampton NN2 6LS

- 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 Jomy Roshan against the decision of Northampton Borough Council.
 - The application Ref N/2016/0786, dated 7 June 2016, was refused by notice dated 22 August 2016.
 - The development proposed is the erection of an extension to the side of the property to provide an extended kitchen and dining room at ground floor level and a further bedroom with en-suite at first floor level.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. It is considered that the main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area, in particular the streetscene.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a 2-storey semi-detached dwelling situated at the junction of Thornton Road and Motspur Drive and is located within a predominantly residential area comprising 2-storey semi-detached and terraced dwellings of similar design and materials. Some of these other dwellings have been extended, including 2-storey side extensions of varying designs which have been identified by the appellant and the Council. Some of these extensions are not of a high standard of design, particularly because of their flat roofs. By reason of their quality of design, these other schemes do not amount to precedents for other potential extensions, especially where they pre-date the design guidance contained in the Council's *Residential Extensions and Alterations Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document* (SPD).
 4. A 2-storey extension to the side of 2 Motspur Drive, which is the dwelling attached to the appeal property, has been erected where the front elevation is set back from this dwelling's front elevation and the ridge of the extension's
-

roof is lower than the original ridge. This extension has the type of subservient appearance that is sought by the SPD which specifically refers to the ridge of a 2-storey side extension being lower than the host property's roof.

5. The proposed development includes the erection of a 2-storey extension. The design of the appeal scheme does not have a front elevation set back from the property's original front elevation and the ridge height would be the same as the existing roof. I have carefully noted the claims of the appellant about the need for the proposed extension and the internal space dictating that the existing and proposed front elevations should be flush. However, when the lack of any setting back of the proposed front elevation is taken together with the lack of any difference in the ridge height of the roofs, the resulting extension would not appear a subservient addition to the host property. Because of its design and bulk the appeal scheme would unbalance, rather than be in keeping with, the character and appearance of this pair of already sympathetically altered semi-detached dwellings.
6. Although there are some positive aspects of the design, including the replication of the bay windows and the hipped roof form, they are substantially outweighed by the unacceptable harm which would be caused to the character and appearance of this pair of semi-detached dwellings within the streetscene.
7. For the reasons given, it is concluded that the proposed development would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the streetscene and, as such, it would conflict with Policies E20 and H18 of the Northampton Local Plan, Policy S10 of the West Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy and the SPD. Amongst other matters these policies include high quality design requirements, including the design of extensions being in keeping with the character and appearance of the original property. These policies are consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework's (the Framework) core principle of securing high quality design. Accordingly, and taking into account all other matters including the Framework's presumption in favour of sustainable development, it is concluded that this appeal should be dismissed.

D J Barnes

INSPECTOR