



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 July 2019

by Sarah Colebourne MA, MRTPI

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

Decision date: 22 July 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/U2805/D/19/3227897

10 Spinney Grove, Corby, NN17 1HT

- 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 John Ferguson against the decision of Corby Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 18/00790/DPA, dated 22 November 2018, was refused by notice dated 4 February 2019.
 - The development proposed is a single storey front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Reasons

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the Lloyds Conservation Area (CA). Its significance derives from its historic value as a residential housing estate built in the 1930's for the town's steel workers. The uniform appearance and traditional style of the houses, based on local vernacular and estate buildings and their largely unchanged nature, many with symmetrical balanced frontages, contribute strongly to its architectural value.
3. 10 Spinney Grove is an end terrace property in a row of four dwellings within a small cul-de-sac where houses are positioned symmetrically around a small central green. It occupies a central position within the cul-de-sac and can be clearly seen from the junction with Thoroughsale Road. None of the other dwellings in the terrace have front extensions but there have been some changes to the terrace, including a two storey side extension currently under construction at the appeal dwelling. However, that extension is set back significantly from the front elevation and as the main frontage remains largely symmetrical and balanced the terrace provides a good example of the former workers' housing. The Council's CA Appraisal advises that the proposed design for extensions will have to be carefully considered, avoiding front extensions. Although it does not form part of the development plan, given the largely unaltered character of this terrace, it is a material consideration in this case.
4. The siting of an extension on the main front elevation would unacceptably alter the appearance of the dwelling and the terrace. Whilst the proposed extension would only have a small forward projection and its materials and detail would reflect those of the dwelling, it would occupy the full width of the main front elevation. Thus by reason of its siting and size, it would dominate the front elevation of the appeal dwelling and would disrupt the symmetry of the terrace.

Although the cul-de-sac has no passing traffic, the proposal would be clearly seen from the junction and by those passing along Thoroughsale Road.

5. There have been some changes to properties within the cul-de-sac and the wider area which I agree with the appellant are not all positive and some detract significantly from the area. However, I am not fully aware of the circumstances of behind those that have permission and they do not provide justification for this unacceptable development.
6. The proposed extension would therefore result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the Lloyds CA and would fail to preserve or enhance its heritage significance. Whilst the harm would be less than substantial, it carries considerable weight and importance.
7. I have noted the appellant's submissions regarding the size of the front living room and future intention to provide accommodation for an ageing parent but am not persuaded that the proposed extension is necessary for an acceptable standard of living or that it would provide essential elderly person's accommodation. As such, I am satisfied that my decision has had due regard to the Public Sector Equality Duty under the Equality Act 2010 and the Human Rights Act 1998 (HRA). Furthermore, those matters do not amount to public benefits that would be sufficient to outweigh the harm that would be caused.
8. For the reasons given, I conclude that the proposal would be contrary to the Council's development plan policies 2 of the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (2016) and 10(R) of the Corby Borough Local Plan (1997) which seek to protect heritage assets. It would also be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework which has similar objectives. There are no material considerations that justify determining the appeal otherwise and the appeal should be dismissed.

Sarah Colebourne

Inspector