

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 August 2020 by John Gunn DipTP Dip DBE MRTPI

Decision by R C Kirby BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9 September 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/L2820/D/20/3250356

105 Warkton Lane, Kettering, Northants NN15 5AB

- 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 M Smith against the decision of Kettering Borough Council.
 - The application Ref KET/2020/0076, dated 8 January 2020, was refused by notice dated 1 April 2020.
 - The development proposed is two storey rear and single storey side extension.
-

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.

Preliminary Matter

3. Notwithstanding the description of development set out above, which is taken from the application form, it is clear from the plans and accompanying details that the development comprises two storey rear and side extension with single storey rear and first floor front extension. The Council dealt with the proposal on this basis and so shall I.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal site is situated in an attractive residential cul-de-sac, characterised by 8 large detached dwellings. The dwellings are located on wide fronted plots with well-defined building lines and small gaps between the properties. They are set a modest distance back from the road with open landscaped front gardens, utilising a similar palette of materials.

6. The host property is similar in design to 5 others within the cul-de-sac. Although some of these properties have been extended and altered, they have retained their distinctive front mansard roof within which is a flat roof dormer or dormers.
7. The appeal proposal would remove the mansard roof and dormer features and would introduce a projecting, prominent front gable feature and gabled two storey side extension, both of which would be alien additions, not characteristic of the host property or the streetscene. The proposal would not be sympathetic to local character and would erode the strong sense of place that exists within this part of Warkton Lane.
8. I visited the nearby streets, including further along Warkton Lane and the housing estate known as 'Bertone Manor'. I saw that elsewhere in Warkton Lane the overall character of the built environment was more varied than the cul-de-sac within which the appeal property is located, with gabled roofs more evident. As a result, whilst acknowledging that the extensions at Nos 117 and 125 Warkton Lane did have some similarities to the appeal proposal, their context was different. The housing development at 'Bertone Manor', was of a higher density than the area neighbouring the appeal site. It lacked the spaciousness and maturity of the area adjacent the appeal site. Therefore, the examples submitted by the appellant of other developments in the locality are not directly comparable with the appeal proposal. They do not provide justification for it.
9. I note the appellant's desire to improve his home. However, it is clear that there are other alternatives to increase the quality of accommodation. Noteworthy are the extensions granted permission¹ in 2019 which provide broadly similar accommodation to that proposed in this case. However the approved design would include the mansard and dormer features that are characteristic of the area. This matter does not outweigh the identified harm.
10. In the light of the above, I conclude that the proposed development would have a harmful effect upon the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area, contrary to Policy 8 of the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy 2011-2031 which requires development, amongst other matters to respond to the site's immediate and wider context and local character. Moreover, the proposal conflicts with the design aims of the National Planning Policy Framework. There are no material considerations which indicate that the proposal should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan.

Conclusion and Recommendation

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

J Gunn

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

¹ Ref KET/2019/0486

Inspector's Decision

12. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

RC Kirby

INSPECTOR