



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 15 June 2021

by Rachel Hall BSc MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 07 July 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/U2805/D/21/3273232

7 Greeve Close, Corby NN18 8LW

- 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 Mrs Eli Fidanova against the decision of Corby Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 20/00588/DPA, dated 24 December 2020, was refused by notice dated 12 February 2021.
 - The development proposed is a new side extension at first floor level and internal alterations.
-

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 building and surrounding area; and
 - the living conditions of the occupants of 28 Greeve Close with respect to outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. No 7 is in a relatively high density residential area characterised by houses with small front gardens and drives. The garage adjoining the side elevation is separated from the road by only a narrow strip of grass without a pavement. The house fronts on to Greeve Close but is located on a bend such that it is prominent in the street scene, with its front and side elevations highly visible from the Close.
4. The house is semi-detached with No 5 and appears symmetrical to it, aside from the single storey garage to the side on No 7. Together these two houses are essentially a mirror image of the pair of semi-detached houses at Nos 1 and 3 Greeve Close, including the side garage at No 1. The sense of symmetry is perceived from the front of the properties and is a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the Close. Pairs of detached and semi-detached symmetrical properties, which appear to have been constructed around the same time to a common typology, are characteristic of the area, as are broadly regular spaces between pairs at first floor level.
5. Whilst the existing garage is not symmetrical with its adjoining neighbour, it is single storey and appears subservient to the main bulk of No 7. The sloping

roof of the garage maintains a degree of openness at first floor level. The proposal would, however, appear as a continuation of the existing building at first floor level, with the same ridge height and roof line, reducing the sense of symmetry and openness there. Consequently the extension would appear overly dominant in the Close, emphasised by its prominent corner position. It would also detract from the sense of symmetry with No 5, as well as with Nos 1 and 3.

6. The use of materials to match the existing building would ensure the appearance of the proposal blends with materials on the existing building and others in the Close. However this does not alter that the proposal would appear at odds with the form of the existing building and its surroundings.
7. I observed a range of garage styles in the vicinity. Whilst there were some examples of integrated garages in the Close, the prevailing pattern of development was of garages adjoining (rather than integrated with development above) or detached from the main house. I also observed other examples of extensions of a similar nature to the appeal proposal in the wider area, including at 12 and 28 Lovap Way. However the position of these houses and their extensions relative to neighbouring houses, being less dominant in the street scene, means that they are not directly comparable. In any event those extensions are some distance from the context in which No 7 is perceived.
8. I therefore conclude that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the building and the surrounding area. As such it would be contrary to Policy 8 of the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy 2011-2031 (July 2016) ('Core Strategy'), and saved Policy P10(R) of the Corby Borough Local Plan (originally adopted 1997). Amongst other matters, these policies seek to ensure development responds to, and does not adversely affect, its local character and context. For similar reasons it would be contrary to paragraph 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the 'Framework'), which sets out that development should be sympathetic to local character.

Living conditions

9. The proposed side extension would be highly visible from bungalows adjacent to the site, particularly from No 28 which faces on to the side elevation of the appeal site. The current outlook from No 28 comprises, to a large extent, the side elevation of the single storey garage at No 7. The proposal would extend the side elevation to first floor level in a manner, reasoned above, incongruous in terms of local character.
10. Although I accept Greeve Close runs between Nos 7 and 28, there is highly limited separation between facing elevations (far less than elsewhere in the surrounding area). In that context, given the proximity of the extension to No 28, with both No 7 and No 28 being positioned close to the road edge, this would result in an unacceptable enclosing effect on the outlook from No 28 to the detriment of living conditions of occupiers of that property.
11. Consequently I conclude that the proposal would harm living conditions for the occupants of No 28 with respect to outlook. It would therefore be contrary to Policy 8 of the Core Strategy and saved Policy P10(R) of the Corby Borough Local Plan which amongst other things, aim to avoid unacceptable impacts on the amenities of neighbouring properties.

12. On the evidence before me and in light of the orientation of buildings, I am satisfied that the proposal would not result in an unacceptable change to daylight or sunlight for the occupants of No 28. Nor would it harm living conditions for the occupants of other neighbouring buildings, including in respect of privacy, noise and disturbance. However this is effectively a neutral finding in my assessment of the scheme.

Other Matters

13. The lack of objection from the Council's Sustainability Officer and from neighbours does not justify the harm I have identified. Whilst I appreciate that the development would create more living space for the appellant and their family, this is essentially a private benefit of the proposal. The form of the extension, resulting in harm to the character and appearance of the building and surrounding area, and harm to the living conditions of the occupants of No 28 with respect to outlook, carries substantial weight against the proposal (which is not outweighed by any other matters).

Conclusion

14. For the above reasons, having considered the development plan as a whole, the Framework and all other relevant material considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Rachel Hall

INSPECTOR