



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 June 2020 by G Sibley MPLAN MRTPI

Decision by Chris Preston BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 June 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Z2830/D/19/3242566

98 Puxley Road, Deanshanger MK19 6PL

- 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 Mrs Stephanie Tombling against the decision of South Northamptonshire Council.
 - The application Ref: S/2019/1735/FUL, dated 11 July 2019, was refused by notice dated 31 October 2019.
 - The development proposed is a front double storey extension. Projecting 2 metres from existing property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issues

3. The effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of host dwelling and the street scene.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. No.98 Puxley Road is a detached two storey dwelling with a gable roof that is constructed from yellow brick and has a brown tiled roof and the two dwellings either side of No.98 are similarly designed. Within the street scene there are two distinct styles of dwellings. Half of which are similar to No.98 and the others are gable fronted dwellings. All of the dwellings are generally located behind a front garden or off-street parking. There is some variation in the detailed design of the dwellings and the materials used but nevertheless the two styles of dwellings complement each other which is an attractive feature of the local street scene. Although many dwellings within the surrounding street scene appear to have been extended where front extensions have been constructed, they are typically single storey extensions. Two storey additions are located to the rear where they are less prominent in the street scene, as is the case of the neighbouring property. The smaller single storey front extensions that are evident do not significantly change the prevailing character of the estate.

5. The proposed extension would extend from the front elevation of the dwelling and would create a double fronted gable extension that would extend out approximately 2 metres(m). The existing dwelling and the two dwellings either side of it have side facing gables and the proposed double fronted gable extension would completely change the front elevation of the dwelling and would have a distinctive appearance that would not match the other dwellings within the street scene. The depth and height of the proposed two-storey front extension combined with the change in roof design would not appear subservient to the host dwelling.
6. The dwelling is located in the middle of a run of three dwellings. No.98 and No.100 share a building line but the dwelling at the junction with Glebe Road, immediately to the east of the appeal site, is set back further from the street. Due to the staggered arrangement the proposed extension would create a large blank wall that would extend out significantly in front of this dwelling. The extension would also bring the building line of the dwelling forward of No.100. Whilst a staggered building line would not be uncommon within the street because the dwelling is located within the centre of three dwellings it would have a building line significantly forward of the dwelling on one side and slightly further forward the dwelling on the opposite side of it.
7. As such, the proposed extension would appear unduly dominant within the context of those three dwellings which would be further exacerbated by the double fronted gable roof which would add to the bulk of the property and introduce a design feature that would be out of character with the simple style of the surrounding estate. In addition, the fenestration depicted on the hand drawn plans shows an inconsistent arrangement of windows, with two comparatively narrow and shallow windows at ground and first floor level to one side of the dwelling. That would contrast awkwardly with the existing arrangement of windows within the surrounding street scene where there is a greater consistency in depth and width, notwithstanding the minor alterations to the first-floor bedroom window on the current property. Consequently, the proposal would detract from the existing pattern of development which would cause harm to the character and appearance of the street scene.
8. Therefore, the design and location of the two-storey front extension would appear as an incongruous addition to No.98 that would not respect the existing appearance of the dwelling and due to the scale of the extension it would not appear subservient to it. The proposed double fronted gable roof would also not respect the pattern of development within the street scene. Consequently, the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene. Therefore, the proposal would be contrary to policies G3 and EV1 of the South Northamptonshire Local Plan (adopted 1997) (LP) which states that development should be compatible in terms of type, scale, siting, design and materials used with the existing character of the site and its surroundings. The proposal would be also be contrary to the guidance set out in the Residential Extensions Supplementary Planning Guidance and the South Northamptonshire's Design Guide (adopted 2017) both of which note that front extensions would almost always detrimentally impact upon the form, symmetry, composition and proportions of the front facade of buildings. The proposal would also be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework.

Other Matters

9. The appellant has referred to a number of dwellings that have been extended within the street scene. Specific reference has been made to a neighbouring property that has a rear double gable extension. The proposed extension would have a similar design but because that extension is located to the rear of the dwelling, the harmful effect that extension has upon the character and appearance of the street scene is limited. Further to this, because it is located to the rear that extension also has a limited harmful effect upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling. The other front extensions within the street scene are typically single storey extensions that appear subservient in scale and appearance.
10. Whilst the LP was adopted prior to the adoption of the Framework, the policies referred to in the decision notice were saved by a direction under paragraph 1(3) of Schedule 8 to the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. The two policies are design based policies and are consistent with the aims and objectives of the Framework which looks to ensure developments are sympathetic to local character and history and are visually attractive as a result of good architecture and consequently the policies are relevant in the determination of this appeal.
11. I recognise that the extension is intended to provide space for the appellant and her family. However, limited information of the precise family arrangements has been provided and, in any event, personal circumstances will seldom outweigh more general planning concerns. Therefore, the other matters raised do not outweigh the harm that would arise.

Conclusion and Recommendation

12. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

G Sibley

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

13. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report, and, on that basis, I agree that the appeal should be dismissed.

Chris Preston

INSPECTOR