



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 March 2022

by David Troy BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 01 April 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/M2840/D/22/3292322

20 Horselease Close, Gt Oakley, Corby NN18 8HU

- 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 and Mrs R Ferguson against the decision of North Northamptonshire Council.
 - The application Ref NC/21/00404/DPA, dated 15 September 2021, was refused by notice dated 30 November 2021.
 - The development proposed is first floor extension above existing single storey element of the property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed first floor side extension on the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two storey detached dwelling with a single storey extension to the side and a small two storey gable projecting from the front of the property. It is located in a mature well-established residential area characterised by detached and semi-detached properties of varied styles and design set back from the road behind front gardens/driveways. No. 20 Horselease Close being situated on a corner plot has even more expansive grounds, which add to the open character and appearance of the street scene.
4. The appeal proposal would involve the construction of a first floor extension over the side extension set back about 0.3m from the front elevation of the property. The proposed extension would be set back from the public highway and constructed with a gabled tiled roof to match the existing property.
5. The appeal property is on a relatively spacious plot and as such the extension would not appear overlarge, relative to the overall plot size. The scale and form of the proposed first floor extension built to the side of the main house would nevertheless still be a significant addition relative to the main property. As such, although set back from the front elevation, the proposed extension would result in substantial bulk at the side of the main dwelling that would be out of character with the more modest form and appearance of the host building and would compromise the sense of space and openness in the area.

6. These shortcomings would be exacerbated by the proposal's prominent position, where the proposed first floor extension would be visible from a number of public vantage points along Horselease Close and Headway. The proposed first floor extension, by virtue of its scale, siting and design, would fail to achieve an appropriate degree of subordination to the host property and would detract from its architectural integrity. As such, I consider that the proposed extension would result in an incongruous and out-of-keeping addition that would cause unacceptable harm to the host property and the area.
7. I have considered the appellant's arguments that the design and layout of the extension have been carefully considered in order to take into account the character of the host property and to minimise any impacts on the area. However, whilst the use of matching materials and fenestrations would assist in integrating the proposal with the host property and the area, these aspects do not overcome the adverse effects outlined above.
8. Consequently, I conclude that the proposed first floor side extension would adversely harm the character and appearance of the host property and the area. It is contrary to Policy 8 of the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy 2016 that, amongst other things, seeks to ensure that development proposals are of a high standard of design that respond to the local character and characteristics of the site's immediate and wider context. The proposal would also not accord with the National Planning Policy Framework that developments should seek to secure a high quality of design (paragraph 126) that are sympathetic to the local character (paragraph 130).

Other Matters

9. I have noted the other developments in the area drawn to my attention by the appellant. However, the various extensions and alterations on the properties within the surrounding area have different development characteristics to the appeal scheme and were approved in a different policy context. In any event, each proposal falls to be assessed primarily on its own merits and I am unaware of the full circumstances associated with these other cases.
10. The appellant considers the proposal would constitute a sustainable form of development in line with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework. I have considered the various benefits put forward by the appellant that the proposal would bring, including providing additional accommodation to meet the family's needs and contributing to the local economy through additional building work. While I have given them some weight, these modest benefits would not be sufficient to outweigh the harm I have identified. For all these reasons, there are no other material considerations to outweigh the development plan conflicts identified.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

David Troy

INSPECTOR