
Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 9 February 2023

by David M H Rose BA(Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1 March 2023

Appeal Reference: APP/M2840/D/22/3305041
51 Roman Way, Desborough, Kettering, NN14 2QL

- 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 Matthew Williams against the decision of North Northamptonshire Council.
 - The application Reference NK/2022/0125, dated 2 March 2022, was refused by notice dated 22 June 2022.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side and single storey front extension¹.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. Flowing from the Council's reason for refusal, the main issue is whether the proposed two storey side extension would, by reason of its location, size and mass, appear as an unacceptably dominant and visually intrusive feature in the street scene, and whether the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. Roman Way, within the vicinity of the appeal site, is characterised by semi-detached houses, some of which have had modest and proportionate additions. The proposed extension would broadly double the width of the existing dwelling, in two storey form, and follow the front and rear walls of the original house. It would have a common ridge line and occupy most of the remaining width of this corner plot.
4. In my view, the proposal would appear out of scale with the existing dwelling and result in an unbalancing effect on its attached neighbour. Moreover, its uncharacteristic and dominating appearance would be compounded by its focus and prominence, given the manner in which the land falls from Roman Way into Millholm Road.
5. Despite the adoption of matching windows and elevation treatments, I conclude that the proposed two storey side extension would, by reason of its location, size and mass, appear as an unacceptably dominant and visually intrusive feature in the street scene, and the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

¹ I have used the simplified description of development given by the local planning authority and adopted by the appellant

6. It follows that the proposal would be in conflict with Policy 8(d)(i) of the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (2016) and the development plan when read as a whole.
7. I have noted the examples of other extensions in the locality that have been drawn to my attention. However, as none of these are comparable in terms of scale and location, I find nothing to lead me to a different conclusion.
8. Having considered these, and all other matters raised, and noting the representations made at application stage, the appeal is dismissed.

David MH Rose

Inspector