



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 July 2021

by D Szymanski BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16th July 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/U2805/D/21/3268219

7 Mersey Green, Corby NN17 2JF

- 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 McCann against the decision of Corby Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 20/00524/DPA, dated 13 August 2020, was refused by notice dated 19 January 2021.
 - The development proposed is Two storey side extension, rear single storey extension and re-roofing of conservatory.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for Two storey side extension, rear single storey extension and re-roofing of conservatory at 7 Mersey Green, Corby NN17 2JF in accordance with the terms of application Ref 20/00524/DPA dated 13 August 2020, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans/drawings numbered: 20.16-03C, 20.16-05A, and the Site Location Plan.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises a two storey dwelling at the southern end of a short terrace of properties, accessed along a pedestrian walkway front and rear. It adjoins relatively open land to the south used as a parking area. Like many in the area the appeal site terrace comprises short groups of gable roofed properties set in distinctively angled stepped terraces with a small gap at the side of the end of terrace plot.
4. The appeal proposal includes a two storey extension that would enclose the narrow angled gap to the garden wall. The gaps on the neighbouring dwellings and the appeal site are discernible from the parking area and a limited number of neighbouring properties. However, given its limited width and the presence of the open parking area and wider garage arrangement, the gap at the appeal

site dwelling provides a very limited contribution to the character and appearance of the area and street scene.

5. The side extension would be of a limited width across the depth of the dwelling, being set down and back from the roof and front façade to a sufficient degree to be subservient, limiting visibility from properties opposite and from the walkways. The rear alterations would retain the scale and shape of the existing conservatory and include a modest single storey extension to its side. Consequently, the extensions are subservient in scale to the host property and plot and would not be harmful in this regard.
6. As it adjoins walkways and the parking area, like other properties nearby, there is some visibility of the rear of the property. The existing conservatory is set against an existing conifer hedge highly limiting any discernibility of it to the north. The rear works to the conservatory would replicate its shape replacing and modifying the roof and elevations, with new tiles, brickwork, and windows, with the addition of a modest extension with a roof pitch in keeping with the existing dwelling. It would be viewed against the backdrop of the appeal site and neighbouring dwellings, and in the context of other rear projections and conservatories nearby. Therefore, it would be in keeping with its surrounds.
7. The side extension would include roof pitch in keeping with those on the host dwelling and nearby. It would be viewed against the backdrop of and in the context of the existing dwelling and the stepped and angled arrangement of other nearby dwellings and terraces. Consequently, overall, the design, siting and scale of the proposed extensions and works would not be incongruent with, not out of keeping with, and not harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling, area, street scene or surrounding pattern of development.
8. For the reasons set out above the proposed development would be in keeping with and would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. Therefore, it would not conflict with Policy 8 of the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy 2011 – 2031 (2016), which expects development to respond to the site's immediate and wider context, form, and local character. It would also not conflict with section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019) (the Framework), which seeks to achieve well-designed places and amongst other things at paragraph 127 expects development to be sympathetic to local character including the surrounding built environment and maintain a strong sense of place.

Other Matters

9. Access to the rear of the property would be maintained by the existing rear gate. The Council does not raise an objection in respect of the effect of the development upon the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers, and based upon the evidence before me, I see no reason to disagree.

Conditions

10. As well as the standard condition specifying the time limits for commencement of development, a condition requiring compliance with the approved plans is necessary to provide certainty and secure implementation with the proposed design and materials. I have not been provided with any conditions by the Council and no other conditions are necessary.

Conclusion

11. I find the development is compliant with the development plan and the Framework. There are no material considerations that indicate the application should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. For the reasons given above, the appeal is allowed.

Dan Szymanski

INSPECTOR