



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 13 December 2021

by B Plenty BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17th December 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/U2805/D/21/3279534

16 Wharfedale Road, CORBY NN17 2AH

- 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 Lee McLaughlan against the decision of North Northamptonshire Council.
 - The application Ref NC/21/00143/DPA, dated 29 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 5 July 2021.
 - The development proposed is a two-storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. Wharfedale Road largely consists of semi-detached housing within a comparatively loose knit pattern of development. The pairs of dwellings form a consistent rhythm of development, with gaps between adding interest to the street. Despite, the addition of some extensions, gaps in built form contribute well to a sense of spaciousness and offer views of trees and greenery beyond. The appeal site is a corner plot with a narrow entrance that widens to the rear and side. The appeal dwelling is prominent in views looking northeast along the street, being in the centre of an observer's field of vision. The gap, to the side of No 16, provides a view to gardens and planting beyond. This open and verdant view makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area.
4. The National Design Guide (NDG) requires development to create an appropriate relationship with the pattern, size and proportions of existing streets in the local area. The proposed side extension would be a large addition. Its ridgeline and front elevation would only be marginally recessed from the existing dwelling. The proposed extension would not be subservient and would therefore dominate the host dwelling. Accordingly, this would be a disproportionate addition that would be in conflict with the predominant pattern of local development.
5. Furthermore, the design of the proposal offers limited articulation or interest that might segregate it into smaller components to mitigate its visual impact. Its design, in combination with its scale, would be unsympathetic to both the

existing dwelling and the pair of semi-detached properties. This would result in a development that would not complement, and unbalance, the existing pair of dwellings. In contrast, the attached garage to the side of No 14 has a limited impact on the symmetry of the pair of dwellings.

6. Also, due to its width and position, the proposal would substantially erode the gap to the side of the dwelling. The proposal would reduce the sense of spaciousness within the estate. The increased sense of enclosure would be contrary to the largely open pattern of local development.
7. The two-storey side extension at 19 Wharfedale Road was approved in 2004. This does not make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area and was determined within a different policy context. Furthermore, it is in a less prominent location where long views are not as pronounced as within the appeal site. An extension to the detached property of 171 Rockingham Road was approved in 2003. This property, behind the appeal site, stands within a wide plot. It is also alongside a main road and set back from the highway behind a service road. As such, it is within a context with differing characteristics to the appeal site. These examples therefore garner limited weight in favour of the merits of the scheme.
8. Accordingly, the proposed extension would not complement the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. Consequently, the proposal would be contrary to policy 8 of the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy 2016 (JCS), the National Planning Policy Framework (The Framework) and the NDG. These policies seek, among other matters, for development to create a distinctive character by responding to the site's context and to add to the overall quality of an area. However, policy 2 of the JCS relates to the historic environment and the evidence indicates to me that this matter is not relevant to the case.

Other Matters

9. I recognise that there is support in local and national policy for homeowners to invest and improve their homes. However, this support is not without regard to the impact of development on the surrounding area where the Framework requires development to be sympathetic to local character.

Conclusion

10. 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, I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

B Plenty

INSPECTOR