



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 December 2019

by K Savage BA MPlan MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 January 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/U2805/D/19/3228775

35 Milton Road, Corby NN17 2NY

- 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 Mt T Rai against the decision of Corby Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 18/00694/DPA, dated 10 October 2018, was refused by notice dated 20 December 2018.
 - The development proposed is extension to existing front porch to bring it in line with an existing porch on a neighbouring property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for extension to existing front porch at 35 Milton Road, Corby NN17 2NY, in accordance with the terms of application Ref 18/00694/DPA, dated 10 October 2018, 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: 35-Milt-D 001; 35-Milt-D 002; 35-Milt-D 003; 35-Milt-D 004; 35-Milt-D 005; 35-Milt-D 006; 35-Milt-D 007; 35-Milt-D 008; 35-Milt-D 009B; 35-Milt-D 010.
 - 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 Matter

2. The original description of development refers to the proposed extension being in line with an existing porch on a neighbouring property. These words are superfluous to the description and to avoid confusion I have omitted them from the formal decision above.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. Milton Road is a residential street with a mix of semi-detached and terraced properties. No 35 is semi-detached and forms part of the end pair at the northern end of the street on the western side. There is some staggering to the

front building lines along both sides of the street, but this is relatively subtle and, for the most part, there is consistency in the layout and form of the dwellings, which have simple, rendered façades and hipped roofs.

5. A number of dwellings have additions to the front, ranging from a small canopy supported by lightweight posts, through to small enclosed porches around the front door, to larger front extensions incorporating additional internal space. The largest of these on the adjacent side to the appeal site were at Nos 25 and 31, which span more than half the width of the front elevations and include hipped roofs. There is a full width extension directly across the street at No 34. The Council indicates that this does not benefit from planning permission, though it nevertheless forms part of the immediate context of the appeal site.
6. The proposed front extension would replace a small enclosed porch with a full width extension similar to that at No 34. In terms of design, the extension would draw from the surrounding context by incorporating a hipped roof to align with the main dwellings, similar to those at No 25 and 31, and a rendered finish to match the existing dwelling and the prevailing appearance within the street. The extension would be wider than those at Nos 25 and 31, but would be no deeper in projection from the front elevation. As such, it would appear as a similarly modest addition which would not significantly alter the overall massing or form of the dwelling, nor would it be demonstrably more prominent than the neighbouring examples given its similar setback in the plot. Given these factors, the extension would have an acceptable visual impact in respect of the host dwelling and the wider street scene.
7. For these reasons, the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the area. Accordingly, I find no conflict with Policy 8 of the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (2016) or Saved Policy P10(R) of the Corby Borough Local Plan (1997). Together, these policies seek to create a distinctive local character by responding to the site's immediate and wider context and local character to create new streets, spaces and buildings, and permit extensions to houses provided that the appearance of the house and surrounding area is not adversely affected. There would also be no conflict with the design-related aims of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Other Matters

8. The proposal was not refused on the basis of harm to the living conditions of neighbouring occupants, and on the evidence before me, I have no reason to conclude otherwise.

Conditions

9. To provide certainty, a condition is required specifying the relevant drawings. It is also necessary to impose a condition requiring external surface materials to match the existing dwelling in order to secure a satisfactory appearance.

Conclusion

10. For these reasons, the appeal is allowed.

K Savage

INSPECTOR