
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 July 2019

By K Winnard LL.B (Hons) Solicitor

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13th August 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/U2805/D/19/3229799
27 Brunswick Gardens Corby NN18 9ER

- 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 and Mrs Long against the decision of Corby Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 19/00037/DPA, dated 30 January 2019, was refused by notice dated 3 April 2019.
 - The development proposed is a two storey front extension, internal alterations and new pitched roof to existing garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two storey front extension, internal alterations and new pitched roof to existing garage at 27 Brunswick Gardens Corby NN18 9ER in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 19/00037/DPA, dated 30 January 2019, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Site Block Plan DWG No. LON 306 PA 001, Garage Proposed Plan and Elevations DWG No. LON 306 PA 200B, Proposed Plans and Elevations DWG No. LON 306 PA 100.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Procedural Matters

2. Although intended to be an access required site visit, the site visit was undertaken on an unaccompanied basis and there was the opportunity to see the site of the proposed development from the highway.
3. The development, the subject of the appeal, has a number of different elements. The Council has raised no objections to the internal alterations and the new pitched roof to the garage and accordingly I shall direct my assessment to the two storey front extension element of the proposal.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are (i) the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area and (ii) highway safety as a result of parking provision.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

5. The appeal property (No 27) is a detached chalet type property on a corner plot located at the entrance of Brunswick Gardens, bounded on three sides by the highway. Other than the front part of the plot, it is well screened on its boundaries by vegetation and shrubbery. Brunswick Gardens is a relatively modern housing development consisting of large detached two storey houses. The estate as a whole is highly varied in terms of the scale, appearance and layout of dwellings.
6. The proposed design of the two storey front extension would materially alter the appearance of No 27. However, the dormer which would be replaced is of limited architectural merit and the proposed proportions of the front projection would replicate the height of the host dwelling. The balance of the front façade would be retained with windows either side of the extension, and the form of No 27 would be respected. In this position, at the end of the road and viewed in context of the development at Brunswick Gardens, the two storey gable would not appear out of place in the street scene.
7. Whilst the front projection would extend beyond the current built form on this side of the highway, there would remain an adequate set back from the highway. This would not, in my view, have a negative effect on the street scene nor disrupt the character of “book end” development. There is no regularity to the pattern of development on this side of Brunswick Gardens. Properties do not have a dominant building line due to their differing designs, their orientations to the highway, which curves away to the junction with Viking Way, and the greater distances between properties. The resulting development would be closer to the highway and the appearance of the street scene would be altered. Nonetheless, the proposal would retain that element of “book end” development associated with No 27 at this location.
8. I therefore conclude that the proposal would not have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the area and would be of an appropriate scale and form to the host dwelling. Accordingly, there is no conflict with Saved Policy P10(R) of the Corby Borough Local Plan (1997) and Policy 8 of the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy 2011-2031 (Adopted 2016) (Core Strategy) which requires alterations and extensions not to adversely affect the appearance of the house and the surrounding area and to respond to a site’s immediate and wider context in creating buildings which draw on the best of that local character. It would also not conflict with the guidance within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which aims to secure development which is sympathetic and which responds to local distinctiveness and character.

Highway Safety

9. The extension increases the number of bedrooms at the property from three to four. Under the Northamptonshire Parking Standards (NPS guidance) three parking spaces should be provided for a four bedroom dwelling, discounting

garages in calculating the number of parking spaces available. I note that the figures within the NPS guidance specifically applies to new development and in the case of extensions the NPS guidance provides that such applications are treated on their own merit based on the local character and information within the NPS guidance.

10. There is no evidence that there are any vehicle parking problems in this location that raise concerns about the safety of highway users and on my site visit I observed no obvious on street parking pressures. Whilst the size of the existing garage at No 27 falls outside the required stated dimensions within the NPS guidance it could nonetheless accommodate at least one moderate sized car. In addition, the current proposal would remove the central pier and the two smaller doors of the existing garage to be replaced by one double width door. This improved arrangement would have the effect of making the garage easier to use for parking. I also noted on my site visit that it is possible to park two small vehicles clear from the footway on the hardstanding in front of the double garage. Given these circumstances and the absence of clear evidence as to a local parking issue, I do not consider that the proposal would result in unacceptable harm to the safety of highway users. As such, the development would not conflict with Policy 8 of the Core Strategy which seeks to ensure highway safety and a satisfactory provision for parking in accordance with adopted standards. Nor would it be in conflict with the NPPF which provides that applications should only be refused on highway grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety.

Other Matter

11. I note that the Council raises no concerns with regard to the amenity of the occupiers of neighbouring properties and I would agree with this assessment.

Conditions

12. I have imposed conditions in respect of timescale and specifying the approved plans as this provides certainty. I note that two of the plan reference numbers given by the Council appear to be incorrect and so I have used the reference numbers given on the plans. I have imposed a condition relating to matching materials in the interests of safeguarding the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area. The Council has suggested a condition relating to unexpected land contamination. There are however no grounds to believe that the land has been subject to a contaminative use so this condition is unnecessary and accordingly I have not attached it.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given and having taken all other matters into account, I allow the appeal as set out in the formal decision above.

K Winnard

INSPECTOR