



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 September 2023 by Darren Ellis MPlan MRTPI

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5 March 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/U2805/D/23/3320484

3 Masefield Way, Corby, Northamptonshire NN17 2NL

- 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 C Neves against the decision of North Northamptonshire Council.
 - The application Ref NC/22/00409/DPA, dated 29 September 2022, was refused by notice dated 13 March 2023.
 - The development proposed is a 2 storey side extension together with single storey extensions to form store/garage areas and stand alone garden room to rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Background and Main Issue

3. The garden room has been constructed. I have therefore proceeded on the basis that retrospective planning permission has been sought for this element of the scheme. The main issues are therefore the effect of the development on a) the character and appearance of the area; and b) the living conditions of present and future occupiers with specific regard to private garden space.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Character and Appearance

4. Masefield Way and the surrounding streets comprise mainly semi-detached, two storey properties, some of which have been extended. Extensions tend to be single storey, projecting sideways and in some cases forwards. They are generally subservient in scale, height and projection relative to their host so as to maintain a pleasant sense of spaciousness to the street scene which contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area.
 5. The proposed two storey element would be anomalous in the immediate area but narrow in relation to the host building, stepped back from the front and down from the ridge, thus ensuring some subservience. That said, the span, width and projection of the single storey side elements would all but fill the plot
-

up to the side boundary, resulting in a cramped appearance that would erode the spaciousness of the area noticeably and detrimentally.

6. The adjoining property also has a single storey side extension; however, the proposed extension would be wider. As such it would not balance the appearance of the pair of semi-detached properties. With this and the above in mind, the proposed side extension would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. Subsequently, it would conflict with Policy 8 of the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy 2016 (JCS) which, amongst other things, requires development to respond to the site's immediate and wider context and local character.

Garden Space

7. The proposed side extension would be shaped to follow the side boundary. Together with the rear extension and garden room, the footprint of the development as a whole would be such that only a very small area of rear garden space would remain. What would be available would be almost surrounded by built form. This would result in a cramped and confined space, garnering an oppressive experience for users.
8. There is space to the front of the building, but it is adjacent to a public highway and the existing fence is not particularly high and so provides little privacy. It would not therefore be of sufficient quality to consider it an alternative. With this and the above in mind, I am unconvinced that the proposal would provide a satisfactory level or quality of garden space for current or future occupiers. Consequently, it would have an unacceptable effect on the living conditions of existing and future residents. This would conflict with JCS Policy 8 insofar as it requires development to not cause unacceptable impact on the amenities of future occupiers.

Other Matters

9. The proposal would provide additional living and storage space. I would ascribe this moderate weight. Such that it would not be capable of outweighing the harm and development plan conflict to which I would attach substantial weight.

Conclusion and Recommendation

10. There are no material considerations which indicate that a decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. I therefore recommend that the appeal be dismissed.

Darren Ellis

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

11. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's recommendation and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR