



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 September 2019

by Karen Taylor MSC URP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: Friday, 11 October 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/G2815/D/19/3232570

20 Nassington Road, Yarwell, Northamptonshire PE8 6PP

- 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 David Johnson against the decision of East Northamptonshire District Council.
 - The application Ref 19/00303/FUL, dated 14 February 2019, was refused by notice dated 11 April 2019.
 - The development proposed is side and rear extensions.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to the side extension. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to the rear extension and planning permission is granted for the rear extension at 20 Nassington Road, Yarwell, Northamptonshire PE8 6PP in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 19/00303/FUL, dated 14 February 2019, and the plans submitted with it, so far as relevant to that part of the development hereby permitted and 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: PP002 Rev B; PP001 Rev B; 01.
 - 3) The external surfaces of the rear extension hereby permitted shall be constructed in the materials shown on plan no. PP002 Rev B.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal decision is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance on the host dwelling and wider area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is within a predominantly residential area and consists of a detached property set within a courtyard development of four detached properties with similar characteristics within large plots. To the southern boundary of the site is open countryside. The proposed side extension would have a modern and contemporary design but would create a substantial two storey addition to the side elevation of the dwelling which would be disproportionately large and thus have an unbalancing effect on the appearance of the building.

4. Although the side extension would sit below the existing main roof of the house, this would not give it a subservient appearance or address the dominating effect on the host building. Moreover, despite the extension not being visible from the front elevation the sheer scale of the two-storey would overwhelm the original form of the host dwelling.
5. The proposed oriel window detail and excessive glazed areas would also pay little attention to the character of the property and the proposed extension would incorporate materials, such as large amounts of oak cladding and zinc that would not reflect the appearance of those buildings in the immediate courtyard area, they would also be unsympathetic to the appearance of the host property.
6. In terms of views into the site, the height and mass of the proposed two storey side extension would be visible from views along the public footpath across the fields and from the distance when viewed along Sulehay Road. The side elevation would be unduly dominant in appearance, particularly with the contrasting materials and oriel window design and would be a prominent addition. I acknowledge the appellants comments in regard to existing landscaping, but this would not be the case throughout the year, furthermore the appellant accepts that the first floor would be visible. Therefore, the proposed side extension would be detrimental to the character of the property and its positive visual outlook within the rural setting.
7. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposed side extension would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and wider area. It would be contrary to Policy 8(d) of the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy 2011-2031 (CS), adopted 2016 which ensures development will respond to the site's immediate and wider context and local character and respond to the local topography and the overall form, character and landscape setting of the settlement. It would also be at odds with the Council's Design Guide, Residential Extensions & Alterations, 2008 which sets out the principles of good design, particularly in regard to the guidance on materials, windows and size and that developments should be subordinate.
8. For the same reasons the proposed side extension would fail to conform with the policies relating to achieving well-designed places as set out in section 12, of the National Planning Policy Framework, 2019 specifically engaging paragraph 127 thereof, which ensures developments function well and add to the overall quality of the area; are visually attractive; and are sympathetic to local character and history.
9. The proposed rear extension would be single storey and of a modest size creating a sunroom. The rear garden area is enclosed and along this boundary to the north is fencing and hedges, given the position and height of the rear extension it would not be readily visible from the surrounding area. Materials would only match in part to the dwelling but would incorporate large glazing areas. Despite this it would be subservient and form a discreet extension within the confines of the rear garden area. I therefore find no harm in respect of this element of the proposal. As such it would comply with Policy 8(d) of the CS, 2016 as it would respond to the site's immediate and wider context.

Other Matters

10. I acknowledge the appellants' desire to enlarge the family house and that there were no objections from local residents and there are no concerns in regard to neighbouring residential amenities, reduction in garden area and parking. However, this does not justify allowing the proposal or outweigh the harm I have found above in relation to the side extension.

Conditions

11. A condition specifying the time limit and approved plans is necessary as this provides certainty. The Council suggested a condition relating to materials, I have amended the wording slightly to be concise and is imposed in order to safeguard the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

12. The proposed rear extension is both physically and functionally severable from the proposed side extension. I consider a split decision would therefore be a logical outcome. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should succeed in relation to the rear extension. However, in relation to the side extension the appeal should be dismissed.

Karen Taylor

INSPECTOR