The Planning Inspectorate

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 March 2022

**by P Eggleton BSc(Hons) MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 1 April 2022**

**Appeal Ref: APP/M2840/D/21/3287555**
**35 Woodland Avenue, Barton Seagrave, Northamptonshire NN15 6QW**

- 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 A Currall against the decision of North Northamptonshire Council.
- The application Ref NK/2021/0728, dated 24 August 2021, was refused by notice dated 21 October 2021.
- The development proposed is a single storey flat roof side extension.

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed

## Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the area.

## Reasons

3. The proposal would result in a wide, flat roofed, single storey extension that would match the front building line of the house. The use of a flat roof for such a wide addition would ensure that it would be at odds with the character of the original property and given its scale and detailing, it would represent poor design in this context. The lack of relief or setting back of the building line would increase its prominence and together with its significant width, emphasise the poor quality of the design.

4. Whilst the house already has a more modest side extension, its set back and more limited width ensure that it appears as being more in proportion with the dimensions of the house but it is also of lesser prominence. As the house is set down and back from the road, the impact of the new addition would be reduced. The front boundary would also offer further screening. Despite these matters however, the proposal would represent poor design that would detract from the existing character and appearance of the property and the street scene.

5. There is no dispute that the new accommodation would be of benefit to the appellant in providing an additional good sized room and a downstairs toilet. These matters and the economic benefits of building the extension weigh in favour of the proposal. Reference has been made to other extensions in the

area and I was able to view a number of these. I did not find any to be directly comparable. This proposal has to be considered on its own merits in any event, but the other local examples do not provide significant weight in favour of this proposal or offer encouragement for poor design.

6. The council suggest that the proposal would conflict with Policy 8b & d of the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy 2016. The text to the policy does not appear to be directed specifically at the design of extensions. Part d)(i) does state that development should create a distinctive local character by responding to the site's immediate and wider context and local character to create new streets, spaces and buildings which draw on the best of that local character without stifling innovation. The poor design and harm to the character of the street scene would be at odds with these objectives but the relevance of the policy to this proposal appears to be limited.

7. With regard to the *National Planning Policy Framework*, as the proposal would not be visually attractive as a result of good architecture; would not add to the overall quality of the area; and would not be sympathetic to local character, it would be contrary to its design requirements. The *Framework* also offers support for achieving a high standard of amenity for existing users and optimising the potential of sites. Whilst the improved accommodation weighs in favour of the proposal, on balance, it would be at odds with the objectives of the *Framework* overall and this weighs against it in the final analysis.

8. In conclusion, the proposal would represent poor design and although it would have a reduced prominence because of the screening boundary hedge, the set back from the road and its low position and height, it would nevertheless detract from the character and appearance of the property and the wider area. Although there would be benefits to the proposal, these would not be sufficient to outweigh these concerns. I therefore dismiss the appeal.

*Peter Eggleton*

**INSPECTOR**