



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 September 2019

by C Beeby BA (Hons) MIPROW

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 December 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/L2820/W/19/3231690

2 Culloden Drive, Kettering, Northants NN15 5DF

- 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 Stephen Oliver against the decision of Kettering Borough Council.
 - The application Ref KET/2019/0209, dated 29 March 2019, was refused by notice dated 31 May 2019.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side extension and front porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The appellant refers to a number of other developments in the vicinity. It was apparent at my site visit that incorrect addresses had been supplied for two of these, which were referred to in the appeal as Nos 339 and 376 St John's Road. The developments referred to were evidently those at Nos 399 and 377 St John's Road, respectively. I have therefore determined the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the appeal proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a semi-detached dwelling with a prominent position on the corner of Culloden Drive and St John's Road. The surrounding residential estate has generally well-spaced dwellings which are reasonably well set back from the highway. Side gardens of a reasonable size are also a characteristic of corner properties in the area. These factors contribute positively to the area's spacious appearance.
5. The property forms part of a relatively consistent building line on Culloden Drive. This line results in a reasonable set back of dwellings from the road, which adds to the sense of spaciousness.
6. A single storey porch of a modest scale currently occupies part of the appeal site. The low height and limited footprint of this feature allow for the provision of a reasonable area of side garden at the host dwelling which, whilst enclosed

by solid fencing at ground floor level, similarly contributes to the spacious appearance due to the low height of features within it and its lack of built form.

7. The proposal's two-storey height close to the corner, minimal side garden and substantial projection forward of the building line on Culloden Drive would give rise to a cramped appearance. This would be uncharacteristic of the prevailing pattern of development. The resulting dominance of the development at this prominent corner location would create a sense of enclosure in views along Culloden Drive. This would cause material harm to the area's characteristic spaciousness.
8. The proposal would therefore result in unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the area, contrary to Policy 8 of the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (2016), which states that development should create a distinctive local character by responding to the site's immediate and wider context and local character. Further conflict exists with Policy 35 of the Local Plan for Kettering Borough (1995), which sets out that permission will normally be granted for proposals for residential development within towns, where the proposal is compatible with other policies and proposals. Additional conflict exists with the sustainable development and design aims of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019).

Other Matters

9. My attention has been drawn to a number of development schemes on St John's Road, which is in the vicinity of the appeal site. The appellant contends that these have similarities to the appeal proposal. I was able to view these on the day of my site visit.
10. An extension at No 399 St John's Road retains a similar area of space to the side of the development as that currently proposed, and lies forward of the building line. Only limited details of this scheme are before me, such that I have not been able to make a full comparison of the two developments. However, it appears likely that it was assessed against a different policy background. Therefore differing considerations are likely to have applied at the time. Moreover, I am not convinced that the development provides an example which should inevitably be followed even though I have found that harm would result from the appeal proposal.
11. Extensions or dwellings at Nos 68, 94, 173, 211 and 213 St John's Road retain a greater degree of spaciousness to the side of those properties than the appeal scheme proposes. An extension at No 377 St John's Road lies to the front of the dwelling rather than the side and its effect on the area's appearance is therefore dissimilar. These developments are consequently materially different from the current scheme, and they do not alter my conclusions on the proposal.
12. Furthermore, I am required to reach conclusions based on the individual circumstances of this appeal. I therefore attach only minimal weight to the relevance of the other schemes referred to in determining the appeal before me.
13. I have not identified harm to arise from the appearance of the front elevation of the host dwelling which would be reduced by the appeal scheme, and therefore this is a matter to which I attach only minimal weight.

14. If neighbouring occupiers were supportive of the proposal there is nothing before me to persuade me that this support should override the unacceptable harm identified. Therefore this, likewise, is a matter to which I can attach only minimal weight.

Conclusion

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

C Beeby

INSPECTOR