



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 June 2021

by Paul Cooper MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 June 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/H2835/D/21/3272836

14 Milbury, Earls Barton, Northamptonshire NN6 0PZ

- 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 Andrew Goodfellow against the decision of Borough Council of Wellingborough.
 - The application Ref NW/21/00054/FUL, dated 22 January 2021, was refused by notice dated 15 March 2021.
 - The development proposed is extension to the front kitchen.
-

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 surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a brick built detached dwelling, with distinctive front detailing, that is located within a predominately residential area.
4. The appeal proposal is for a single-storey extension to the front of the property, built in matching materials to the host dwelling, it would be approximately 4.5m wide and project approximately 1.8m from the existing front elevation of the host property.
5. I acknowledge that the proposal would utilise materials to match those of the appeal property. In addition, its height would not appear at particular odds with that of other front porches or front extensions in the locality. Nonetheless, the proposal would protrude noticeably further forward than the existing dwelling. Such a depth and width would afford the proposal an overly bulky and visually dominant appearance and would fail to reflect and respect the prevailing general pattern of development along Milbank. This would give rise to considerable harm to the character and appearance of the area.
6. Whilst there is a mix of dwelling styles and detailing designs on Milbank, there is a general similarity in the locality. I have had regard to the numerous examples of other proposals highlighted within the appellant's statement. These front elevation ground floor projections are not, for the most part, visually dominant in either views of individual dwellings or the wider street scene given their small scale. Consequently, Milbank has a distinctly spacious and harmonious character by virtue of the simple form of its dwellings and

- their set-back from the highway behind relatively open driveways and garden areas.
7. The additional forward projection of the proposal would be out of kilter with the smaller scale of the existing ground floor projections generally found to the front of other dwellings on Milbank. Whilst these and other developments have been pointed out to me in the appellants statement, I have no further details of the works in order to understand the reasoning behind them and these examples do not justify a planning permission and, in any event, each case should be considered on its own merits.
 8. The appeal proposal, if allowed, would give rise to a prominent feature that would be significantly at odds with the current appearance of the appeal property. I find that it would unbalance and harmfully dominate the façade of the host dwelling by virtue of its significant forward projection against the simple form of the dwelling. The proposal would also harmfully disrupt the general symmetry of the street scene by causing a significant and incongruous imbalance to the front elevations. Substantial forward projections from the main front walls are not a characteristic of these house types.
 9. The houses are also set back from the highway which ensure the street has a degree of spaciousness. This spaciousness is an important positive characteristic of the locality
 10. The proposed extension would encompass a significant proportion of the front elevation of the dwelling. The roof would attach to the existing dwelling below the windows at first floor level. It would be faced with brickwork and include a single wide window to the front elevation. Given the relatively small size of the front garden and the scale of the proposal, it would appear highly prominent in views from Milbank. Its position, and scale, set forward, would appear incongruous and conflict with the existing pattern of development referred to in my reasoning above. For these reasons the proposal would be unsympathetic and at odds with the character and appearance of the street scene as a whole. It is acknowledged that a small number of properties on Milbank feature single storey front extensions. However, it appears these are in the minority and are not characteristic of the road and area.
 11. In summary, I find that the proposal is contrary to Policy 8 (d) of the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (2016) and Policy EB.GD1 of the Earls Barton Neighbourhood Plan which, amongst other matters, expect development to be in keeping with local character, and respond to the immediate and wider context and local character, as well as the guidance set out in Paragraph 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework and the Residential Extensions – A Guide to Good Design SPG.

Conclusion

12. Therefore, for the reasons given above, and taking into account all other matters, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Paul Cooper

INSPECTOR