



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 February 2023

by R Jones BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7th March 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/W2845/D/22/3306306

32 Moulton Road, Holcot NN6 9SH

- 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 Damari Nandi against the decision of West Northamptonshire Council.
 - The application Ref WND/2022/0430, dated 19 July 2022, was refused by notice dated 6 May 2022.
 - The development proposed is single storey and two storey extension to rear, single storey and two storey extension to side, and single storey extension to front.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for single storey and two storey extension to rear, single storey and two storey extension to side, and single storey extension to front at No.32 Moulton Road, Holcot NN6 9SH in accordance with the terms of the application, WND/2022/0430, dated 6 May 2022, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Existing Plans and Elevation – drawing no. (00)01; and Proposed Plans and Elevation – drawing no. (00)102.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development shall be in accordance with the materials set out in the application form, dated 6 May 2022.

Main Issues

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed side and front extension on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Procedural Matter

3. The description of development in the banner heading above has been taken from the Council's decision notice, as this provides a fuller description of the proposals before me than provided on the planning application form. It is also the description that the appellant has used in part E of the appeal form.

Reasons

4. No.32 Moulton Road (No.32) is a two-storey end of terrace dwelling on the north-western side of Moulton Road. It forms part of two blocks of four terraced dwellings (Nos.26 to 40 Moulton Road) that are generally uniform in their appearance, constructed in brick, with a pitched roof and simple fenestration and porch details. No.32 has an existing single storey storage and boiler room that wraps around the north west corner of the dwelling. It is proposed to replace this with a part single, part two-storey rear extension and a two-storey side extension. The Council have found the two storey rear extension to be acceptable and I have no reason to form a different view.
5. The Council's *Designing House Extensions Supplementary Planning Guidance* (SPG) states that it is important that the roof of an extension is a similar pitch and design to the existing and that two-storey flat roofs must be avoided. The proposed two-storey side extension would be around 1.9m in width, with a flat roof 5.3m in height that would broadly align with the eaves of the new rear gable. It is therefore inconsistent with the SPG. The proposed side extension has, however, been set well back from the front elevation of the host dwelling behind the ridgeline of the existing flank gable. Although it would be visible from Moulton Road when travelling from the south west, because of this set back, the proposed flat roof and vertical openings on the flank elevation would be largely obscured by the neighbouring house at No.34 Moulton Road. The proposed side extension would not therefore appear an unduly prominent, or particularly incongruous addition within the streetscene. I find it would not conflict with the objectives of the SPG, namely to ensure that extensions do not spoil the look of a house or area.
6. From the front, the proposal would significantly alter the appearance of the dwelling though the addition of the side extension and the front porch extension, which would project forward of the existing front building line by around 1.3m. Whilst the design of the porch, with a flat roof and vertical emphasis in its fenestration, would result in an appearance that differs from its immediate neighbours I do not find that this in itself would cause harm. Nor do I find that setting the porch forward by a modest amount (and projecting to the side) would compromise the linear form of the two blocks of terraces.
7. Both the side extension and porch are proposed to be finished in a light grey render. Whilst Nos.26 to 40 Moulton Road are constructed in brick, and as described above are generally uniform in appearance, I observed on my site visit that designs of dwellings in the wider surrounding area are mixed. The predominant material is brick, but there are also examples of dwellings finished in render, particularly on the north-west side of Moulton Road. It is not, therefore, a finish that is uncharacteristic of this area.
8. Consequently, on the main issue I conclude that the proposed side and front extension would not cause harm to the host dwelling or the surrounding area. There would therefore be no conflict with Policy ENV10 of the Settlements and Countryside Local Plan (Part 2) for Daventry District 2011-2029 (2020) or paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework which together require development to be of high quality, innovative design that integrates with, and is sympathetic to, its surroundings.

Conditions

9. In addition to the standard condition regarding implementation of the planning permission, it is also necessary, in the interests of certainty, to impose a condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved drawings.
10. The Council has also suggested that the materials of the proposed extensions should match the existing dwelling. As described above, whilst the existing dwelling is built in brick, the side and front extensions would have a light grey render finish. It is clearly intended that the design would incorporate different materials than the existing dwellings and I have therefore amended the condition to instead refer to those materials set out in the planning application form.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

R. Jones

INSPECTOR