



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 March 2024

by J D Westbrook BSc(Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18th March 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/M2840/D/23/3335662

57 Bridge Street, Kings Cliffe, PETERBOROUGH, PE8 6XH

- 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 S Latter against the decision of North Northamptonshire Council.
 - The application Ref NE/23/00855/FUL, dated 10 August 2023, was refused by notice dated 16 November 2023.
 - The development proposed is the construction of a rear single-storey extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the area around Bridge Street.

Reasons

3. No 57 is a detached house situated on the northern side of Bridge Street, within a small group of dwellings located at the eastern edge of the small settlement of Kings Cliffe. It is a double-fronted, stone-built house with accommodation over three floors including in the roof space. It is set approximately 2 metres below the level of the road. It has a single-storey rear extension with a pitched roof, and a garage at the rear to the western side.
4. Policy EN13 of the recently adopted East Northamptonshire Local Plan Part 2 (LP) indicates that development proposals should relate well to and, where possible, enhance the surrounding environment. They will be supported where the design integrates positively with the surrounding area and creates a continuity of street frontage in terms of appearance, layout, massing and scale, and does not detract from the character of the existing building.
5. The Council's Supplementary Planning Document on Householder Extensions (SPD) indicates that, in general, an extension should be designed to take account of the characteristics of the surrounding area. The roof design of side extensions should complement the dwelling and be of a sympathetic style while, with regard to rear extensions, flat roofs should be avoided unless a satisfactory argument can be made for them on design grounds.

6. The Council contends that the proposal, by virtue of its incongruous design and positioning, would not be respectful of the host dwelling and would have a detrimental visual impact on the street scene. The appellant contends that the design of the extension is appropriate for its situation and that, in any case, the dwelling is set well below the level of the road and the extension would not be readily visible, particularly during those parts of the year when front boundary planting would be in full leaf.
7. The construction of the proposed extension would involve the demolition of most of the existing rear extension and its replacement with a larger extension. The new extension would be some 8.9 metres wide and 6.5 metres deep. It would have a height of around 2.85 metres and would have a flat roof. The materials used would be a mix of powdercoat aluminium fascia and window/door surrounds, with render to part of the rear and side elevations. There would be extensive glazed elements at the rear and eastern side. The extension would project beyond the side elevation of the main house by around 1 metre, and the flat roof would overhang a further 0.5 metres to the side.
8. I acknowledge that the extension would be set significantly below road/pavement level and that its visibility would be moderated by front boundary planting. Nevertheless, by virtue of its projection beyond the current side elevation, it would be visible and would appear out of character with the main body of the house. The use of modern materials, in itself, would not necessarily be harmful, but in this context it would appear incongruous as a side projection having some full-height glazing, render, and powdered aluminium features juxtaposed with the uniform stone and traditional window styles of the rest of the main house. In addition, the visible element of flat roof would appear unsympathetic to the design of the host property.
9. There would appear to be a mix of older and more modern properties in the vicinity, but the prevailing character is one of dwellings constructed of stone with pitched tiled roofs and windows largely of traditional scale and design. Whilst much of the proposed extension would be largely hidden behind the house, some of it would be visible and would not relate well to the surrounding environment or to the host property itself. I note the examples of flat-roofed extensions in the vicinity, as identified by the appellant, but these are not visible in the street scene.
10. In conclusion, I find that the proposed extension would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property and the wider surrounding area along this part of Bridge Street. It would conflict with policy EN13 of the LP and with guidance in the SPD. Accordingly, I dismiss this appeal.

J D Westbrook

INSPECTOR