



## Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 9 February 2021

**by Bhupinder Thandi BA (Hons) MA MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 3 March 2021**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/U2805/D/20/3263314**

**4 Caistor Road, Gretton NN17 3DL**

- 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 Rob Newby against the decision of Corby Borough Council.
  - The application Ref 20/00266/DPA, dated 7 July 2020, was refused by notice dated 3 September 2020.
  - The development proposed is conversion of existing garage into Annex accommodation with a small 2 storey extension including a link utility/block to the main building (existing house). Addition of a rear ground floor extension with connecting corridor to existing house.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the area, including whether it would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Gretton Conservation Area (CA).

### Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises a detached dwelling located within a CA. The property has a pleasing simple traditional appearance comprised of stone walls and a tiled roof with a detached garage.
4. Properties along Caistor Road vary in terms of age, design and scale. However, the use of a limited range of brick, stone and tile colours and materials results in a pleasing coherent character. The set back of houses from the roadside, boundary walls and mature frontage planting together with the gaps between houses gives the road a distinctly rural character and feel. Buildings in the CA, despite some minor variations, are constructed from a similar palette of colours and materials which positively contribute to its character.
5. The proposed development would extend the dwelling considerably. The side and rear section would unacceptably dominate the host property through its scale, roof form and contrasting appearance. The link between the host property and the garage would be readily visible in the street scene, despite the existing boundary wall and proposed gate, and the stepped profile of it and the varying heights, materials and roof forms would be jarring elements compared to the simple form and appearance of the existing buildings.
6. The combination of the proposed development's overall scale and mass including varying roof forms and a wide range of materials and finishes would

result in visual confusion diminishing the character, appearance and integrity of the host property.

7. As such, in my judgement the impact on the CA would be harmful. Whilst the harm I have identified would not result in substantial harm, it would still result in harm that requires clear and convincing justification. Paragraph 196 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that where a development proposal would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including where appropriate securing its optimum use.
8. Based on the evidence before me no public benefits have been presented and taking into consideration the points above the harm to the CA would clearly outweigh the public benefits of the proposal. The proposed development would fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the CA and would adversely affect the character and appearance of the host property.
9. The proposed development is therefore contrary to Policies 2 and 8 of the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (2016) which, amongst other things, require development to conserve and enhance heritage significance, complement their surrounding historic environment, respond to the site's immediate and wider context and local character.

### **Other Matters**

10. I acknowledge that the proposed development would not unduly affect parking or the safe operation of the highway. However, this neither counts for nor against the proposal.
11. I note the presence of other extended properties in the surrounding area. However, I have not been made aware of the individual circumstances that led to them being considered acceptable by the Council. In any case, every appeal must be considered on its own merits. The presence of other extensions in the area does not justify the harm that I have identified.
12. Whilst I have given the appellant's personal circumstances careful consideration, I am mindful of the advice contained in 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.
13. I appreciate that the appellant has held discussions with the Council and attempted to overcome concerns previously raised, but the amendments would still result in a proposal that would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area.

### **Conclusion**

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

*B Thandi*

INSPECTOR