
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 January 2022

by D J Barnes MBA BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 24 FEBRUARY 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/W2845/D/21/3286586

Rivendell, 22 Neneside Close, Weedon NN7 4QH

- 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 Miss Claire Evans against the decision of West Northamptonshire Council.
 - The application Ref WND/2021/0104, dated 4 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 23 August 2021.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a loft extension to create a flat roof dormer to front elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. It is considered that the main issues are the effects of the proposed development on (a) the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area and (b) the safety of other highway users.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The appeal property is a bungalow with accommodation within the roof which is sited at the end of a cul-de-sac. The gable end of the property faces the turning head of the road. The property is taller than the other bungalows which front this road and others within the surrounding residential development. The visual prominence of the property is accentuated by being sited on higher ground than the neighbouring bungalows.
4. The proposed development includes the erection of a dormer extension within the property's side roofslope. The Council's *Supplementary Planning Guidance: Designing House Extensions* includes guidance on the design of dormer roof extensions which includes reference to their scale and siting. The siting and design of the proposed extension includes it being off-set from the front elevation but with the other dormer cheek being set back from the rear elevation. As a consequence, the appeal scheme would not be centrally sited within the roofslope. Although set down from the ridge, the proposed development would be sited close to the eaves of the property.
5. Although other bungalows within the surrounding area have been altered, none of the additions which were observed during the site visit are of a similar

scale and siting as the proposed development. The appellant has referred to roof additions along other roads within the village, including Manor Road and St Peters Way which were observed during the site visit, but their detailed planning circumstances have not been provided. By reason of their distance from the appeal property and lack of detailed information, only limited weight has been given to these other schemes in the determination of this appeal.

6. By reason of scale and design, including the lack of an off-set from the rear elevation and the proximity to the eaves, the appeal scheme would occupy a significant proportion of the roofslope and, as such, would be a bulky and incongruous form of development that would visually dominate this simply designed property.
7. The visual impact of such a large extension would be accentuated by the greater height and elevated location of the property when compared to the neighbouring bungalows. Accordingly, the appeal scheme's design would fail to reflect and integrate into the surrounding area. The use of external materials which would match those of the host property would not mitigate the unacceptable harm which has been identified.
8. Reference is made by the appellant to the principle of roof extensions being acceptable because of permitted development right for dwelling houses. However, I am required to determine the appeal based upon the proposed development before me to assess.
9. Accordingly, on this issue it is concluded that the proposed development would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area and, as such, it would be contrary to Policy ENV10 of the Settlements and Countryside Local Plan (Part 2) for Daventry District. Amongst other matters, this policy requires development that is of a high quality and, in particular, proposals being of an exemplary and innovative design that reflect and integrate with the surrounding area.

Highway Safety

10. Based upon the submitted drawings, the proposed development would increase the number of bedrooms from 4 to 5, rather than from 3 to 5. The parking standards provided do not indicate that additional spaces are required for an increase in the number of spaces where there are 4 or more bedrooms.
11. The appellant has provided evidence that the principle of an extension to the existing vehicular access from the cul-de-sac is acceptable in principle to the former Highway Authority. There is no reason to believe this would not remain the case. Further, from what was observed during the site visit, there would be scope within the property's front garden to create additional parking spaces if they were required.
12. For the reasons given, it is concluded that the proposed development would not cause unacceptable harm to the safety of other highway users and, as such, there would not be a conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework which refers to the refusal of planning permission in circumstances where there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety.

Conclusion

13. Although there would not be unacceptable harm caused to the safety of other highway users this matter is significantly and demonstrably outweighed by the unacceptable harm which would be caused to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. Accordingly, it is concluded that this appeal should be dismissed.

D J Barnes

INSPECTOR