



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 August 2020

by **I Radcliffe BSc(Hons) MRTPI MCIEH DMS**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 August 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Y2810/D/20/3253072

45 Daventry Road, Barby, Northamptonshire CV23 8TP

- 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 S Barnes against the decision of Daventry District Council.
 - The application Ref DA/2020/0136, dated 13 February 2020, was refused by notice dated 8 April 2020.
 - The development proposed is a front entrance to property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural matter

2. A front porch has been constructed which I have assessed on the basis of what I saw from the road and the detailed information on the submitted plans.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a semi-detached bungalow located within a long line of such dwellings on the eastern side of Daventry Road. The modest, flat fronted scale of these dwellings, and their set back from the road behind open front gardens with regular gaps between each pair, has resulted in a pleasant streetscene that helps with the transition from the built development associated with the village to the open countryside to the south.
5. Unlike almost all the other bungalows in the row, the appeal property has large dormers which, other than for a small set in from the party wall, occupy the whole of the front and rear roof slopes. As a result, the dwelling is no longer gable ended and has the appearance of having a flat roof.
6. The gable fronted porch is smaller in length and width than the previous proposal dismissed on appeal¹. Nevertheless, it occupies almost half the width of the front elevation and its roof ridge reaches two thirds of the way up the front of the dwelling. Notwithstanding the effect of the dormers in increasing the scale of the bungalow, the overall effect is of an overly large porch that

¹ Ref: APP/Y2810/D/18/3213927

dominates the dwelling and appears incongruous within the streetscene. As the bungalow is no longer gable ended, the gabled form of the porch, emphasised by its triangular skylight, does not complement its appearance. Instead adds to its incongruity.

7. In favour of the scheme, the appellant states that if the porch was only 0.4m shorter in height it would constitute permitted development and would not require planning permission. A point is reached though in terms of the scale of an addition to a dwelling where an extension simply becomes too large for it. In my judgement, for a modest bungalow, albeit one with large roof dormers attached, the scale of the porch exceeds the point at which this occurs. As a result, I attach little weight, as a fallback position, to the existence of permitted development rights in favour of the scheme.
8. 41 Daventry Road has a front porch. However, as it appears less tall than the appeal porch, is narrower and has a hipped roof, it is subservient to the dwelling and so complements, rather than harms, the character and appearance of the dwelling and area.
9. Reference has been made to a number of other front extensions and porches to dwellings in the village on Holme Way, Star Corner and Brackendale. These though are overwhelmingly to two storey houses on streets characterised by two storey dwellings rather than to a bungalow with dormers within a row of bungalows. As a result, they are materially different and are not directly comparable to the porch before me. Moreover, these developments would have been assessed against the development plan policies and guidance that existed at that time and not against the policies of the current development plan. The fact that these extensions were permitted therefore does not set a precedent for the appeal proposal and is a consideration of little weight in favour of the appeal proposal.
10. Taking all these matters into account, I therefore conclude that the proposed porch unacceptably harms the character and appearance of the area, contrary to policy ENV10 of the Settlements and Countryside Local Plan (Part 2) for Daventry District, policy BO-D1 of the Barby and Onley Neighbourhood Development Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework. These policies and the Framework require the protection of the character and appearance of a locality through high quality design that respects local design features.
11. The matters put forward in favours of the scheme individually and collectively are of insufficient weight to outweigh to the harm caused and the conflict that occurs with the development plan. The appeal should therefore be dismissed.

Ian Radcliffe

Inspector