
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 January 2017

by Julia Gregory BSc (Hons), BTP, MRTPI, MCMI

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

Decision date: 26 January 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/U2805/D/16/3159977

2 Kingsley Drive, Corby, NN17 2NJ

- 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 Anthony Webb against the decision of Corby Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 15/00137/DPA, dated 17 June 2016, was refused by notice dated 10 August 2016.
 - The development proposed is a two storey extension to the side of the property consisting of garage space, utility room, W/C. To include one bedroom and an en-suite bathroom above.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the building and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. No 2 comprises a semi-detached two storey dwellinghouse with a hipped roof. The extension would turn the three bedroomed dwellinghouse into a 4 bedroom dwellinghouse.
 4. The extension would be two storeys high with its ridge line partially set down from the ridge of the main house and with a single storey pitched lean-to roof over the front part of the extension. The extension, because it would be large, almost doubling the width of the property, would not be subservient to the host building.
 5. Whilst the extension would reflect certain characteristics of the main house in terms of the angle of the hipped end to the roof and the style of windows, the attached neighbouring property is not so extended. The pair are currently similar in width and roof height and have a balanced appearance which this extension would disrupt.
 6. Furthermore, the overriding character and appearance of the area is that of semi-detached and terraced two storey dwellings with much obvious symmetry and rhythm in the streetscene which the two storey extension would harm.
 7. Because the property is located on the corner of Masefield Way with Kingsley Drive, albeit that the extension would be set back, it would be prominent in views on the approach to Kingsley Drive as well as within Kingsley Drive itself.
-

The tree in front garden would not be in leaf all of the year and so therefore cannot give effective screening for all of the year.

8. Whilst a garage and outbuilding would be demolished to make way for the extension, those buildings are much less prominent and substantial than the extension proposed.
9. I note the example at 246 Rowlett Road brought to my attention but that is extending a terrace in a row with very little to distinguish it from others. The Milton Road example has been carried out to make the development look part of the original design of the two properties unlike the development here. The Willowbrook Road examples either do not have their flank walls to a corner or are within a row of properties. None of the examples appear similar in terms of how they relate to street junctions.
10. No objections from neighbours have been brought to my attention and I acknowledge that the appellant states that his neighbours are quite happy that the development will not cause a problem for them. Nonetheless, the lack of objection does not mean that the development would comply with the development plan.
11. I conclude that the development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the building and the surrounding area. The development would be contrary to Saved Policy P10(R) of the Corby Borough Local Plan which requires that development does not adversely affect the appearance of the house and the surroundings. It would also be contrary to Policy 8 of the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy 2011-2031 which sets place shaping principles including creating a distinctive local character. Furthermore it would be contrary to sections 7 and 11 of the National Planning Policy Framework which advocate good design.

Conclusions

12. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Julia Gregory

Inspector