



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 September 2020

by M Cryan BA(Hons) DipTP MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7 October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/G2815/D/20/3255601

1 Welbourne Close, Raunds, Northamptonshire NN9 6HE

- 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 David Beevor against the decision of East Northants District Council.
 - The application Ref 20/00493, which was received by the local planning authority on 21 April 2020, was refused by notice dated 19 June 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as 'a single storey front extension to existing bungalow to make existing bedroom 2 bigger'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on:
 - The character and appearance of the area; and
 - Car parking provision for the appeal property.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal property is a semi-detached bungalow with a gabled bay on its front elevation. It is on the south side of Welbourne Close, a cul-de-sac of similar properties. As the dwellings along the street have been updated over the years, some variations in detailing have been introduced such as types and materials of window frames, and different cladding materials and colours have been used for gables and under-window panels. However, most of the other dwellings on the street are of the same basic design and appearance as No 1 and are set to uniform building lines on both sides of the road. This gives the street a neat and orderly character.
4. The proposal is to increase the size of a bedroom by extending the front bay towards the street by around 2.2m. Given the modest scale of the existing dwelling and its front garden, although it would not be a large extension in absolute terms it would appear as a disproportionate addition when seen from the street, contrary to the advice in the Council's 2020 Householder Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (the SPD). The extension of the bay would also give the pair of bungalows of Nos 1 and 3 an unbalanced and lopsided

appearance. Its visual impact would be exacerbated by the appeal property's position near to the entrance of Welbourne Close, where the extension in front of the common building line would disrupt the neat and orderly appearance of the street as a whole.

5. The extended bay would retain a gabled front, with the same ridge height as the current bay, and materials to match the existing dwelling would be used. The proposal would therefore be acceptable in these regards, although this would not outweigh the other harm I have found. The appellant has also drawn my attention to the dormer on the front elevation of No 2 opposite, which is a prominent and unusual feature in the context of Welbourne Close. However, I am not aware of the considerations that applied in that case and it cannot be seen as setting a precedent for this proposal which, in any event, would represent a different form of development.
6. I conclude that the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore conflict with Policy 8 of the 2016 North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (the JCS) and with Policy R2 of the 2017 Raunds Neighbourhood Plan, which together seek to ensure that development is well-designed and in keeping with the character of the surrounding area. For the same reasons it would not comply with the requirements of Paragraphs 127 and 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework).

Car Parking

7. In order to try to minimise the demand for and use of on-street parking, both for aesthetic reasons and to reduce the potential risk to highway safety, the SPD seeks to ensure that extended properties retain off-street parking provision in line with the requirements of Northamptonshire County Council's 2016 parking standards. For the appeal property, that means that two off-road parking spaces are required to be retained. At present, the appeal property driveway is long enough and wide enough to accommodate two cars, although the space at the side of the dwelling is constrained between the house side wall and the boundary fence with No 7 Twyford Avenue. The space at the front is constrained on one side only by the fence, and therefore effectively has room for a 3m wide parking space in line with the standard. It appeared to me at the time of my site visit that most dwellings on Welbourne Close have a similar driveway to the appeal property and many residents already park on the street.
8. The proposed extension would narrow the width of the space available for parking on the driveway at the front of the property to no more than 2.5m. This would reduce the quality of the appeal property's parking provision further below that required by the standard. While the front space would theoretically still be able to accommodate a modern car it would be a tight squeeze and it seems likely to me that, in practice, an occupier would more often than not choose to park on the road. In turn this would be likely to lead to a greater obstruction of traffic and increase the potential for conflict and accidents within the street.
9. The appellant has indicated that he would be willing to reduce the length of the proposed extension so that the front space could meet the dimensions required by the parking standards. However, I have not been provided with any alternative drawings of an amended scheme, nor is there information to indicate that this would address the harm to the area's character and

appearance which I have found. I therefore do not consider that this is a matter which can adequately be resolved by use of a condition in this case.

10. I conclude that the proposed development would result in the appeal property having sub-standard car parking provision. The proposal would therefore conflict with Policy B8 of the JCS, which requires development to have satisfactory means of access and provision for parking in accordance with adopted standards.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above the appeal is dismissed.

M Cryan

Inspector