



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 August 2020

by Bhupinder Thandi BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 08 September 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/L2820/D/3253027

1 Chase Hill, Geddington, Kettering, Northamptonshire NN14 1AG

- 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 Kevin Higgins against the decision of Kettering Borough Council.
 - The application Ref KET/2019/0858, dated 12 December 2019, was refused by notice dated 2 March 2020.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side extension and front boundary wall with railings and 1.8m rear fencing.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises a detached dwelling with a two storey gable feature located within a cul de sac. The property is set deep into its plot with a gap to one side creating a sense of openness.
4. Dwellings on the western side of the road despite some differences are in general harmony with each other in terms of their character and appearance displaying prominent gable features, meaningful gaps and largely open frontages that provide a sense of openness. The properties on the eastern side whilst different in appearance contribute to the sense of spaciousness due to their separation and open frontages.
5. The proposed development includes a two-storey side extension and walls and railings to enclose the frontage. Whilst the proposed development would be proportionate to the plot, due to the overall size and mass of the side extension and the extent and height of the proposed walls and railings, the proposal would markedly change the appearance of the dwelling. The proposals would unduly dominate the host property and would result in a prominent and incongruous building that would be at odds with the appearance of properties and the spacious nature of Chase Hill.

6. I acknowledge that the Council does not have a specific policy in relation to building lines. However, the proposed side extension would project a significant amount forward of the front elevation drawing the eye. It would represent an unsympathetic and incongruous feature within the overall street scene and would be significantly at odds with neighbouring properties.

Other Matters

7. I note that the appellant's comments that he wishes to stay in the house and the village with his growing family. Whilst I have given this matter careful consideration, I am mindful of the advice contained within the Planning Practice Guidance that in general, planning is concerned with land use in the public interest. It is probable that the proposal would remain long after the current personal circumstances cease to be material. For these reasons, I find that this factor is not sufficient to outweigh the harm that I have identified.
8. I acknowledge that there would be adequate parking to the front of the dwelling. However, this would not outweigh the harm that I have identified in relation to character and appearance.
9. The support of the neighbours counts neither for nor against the proposal and does not overcome the harm that I have identified in relation to the main issue.
10. I note the representations made in support of the planning application. I acknowledge that the proposal would not adversely impact on the living conditions of nearby occupiers in terms of natural light. However, this does not outweigh the harm that I have identified.
11. As such, I find that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the host property and the area. It would therefore be contrary to Policy 8 of the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (2016) which, amongst other things, requires new development to respond to the site's immediate and wider context and local character to create buildings which draw on the best of local character. It would also be contrary to Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework which, amongst other things, requires new development to add to the overall quality of an area.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons set out above the appeal does not succeed.

B Thandi

INSPECTOR