



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 June 2024

by Ian McHugh DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 July 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/M2840/D/24/3341868

2 Pridmore Close, Woodnewton, Peterborough, PE8 5EY

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Helen Eastwood against the decision of North Northamptonshire Council.
 - The application Ref is NE/23/01295/FUL.
 - The development proposed is first-floor front and single-storey side extensions.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of both the streetscene and the existing dwelling.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a detached two-storey dwelling, which is situated in a small residential development within the village. The properties share similar characteristics in terms of their size, external materials and appearance. In addition, a number of the dwellings have front facing projecting elements including two-storey gables and single-storey garages.
4. The appeal proposal contains two elements. A first-floor extension is proposed above the existing single-storey garage. The plans show a gym on the ground floor with a bedroom and en-suite/bathroom areas above. The extension would be built above the full length of the existing garage. The second element is a single-storey side extension with a flat sedum covered roof. This extension would provide boot room and utility areas.
5. The Council considers that the first-floor extension would harmful to the character and appearance of both the dwelling and the streetscene, because of its size and position. Furthermore, although the single-storey extension is not referred to in the Council's decision notice, I note that the officer's report considers that element would 'unbalance' the appearance of the front of the property and that its modern design would be out of keeping.
6. In reaching my decision, I have considered Policy 8 of the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy 2016, which states (amongst other things) that development should respond to the site's context and local character. In addition, I have also taken into account the content of the

Council's Supplementary Planning Document – Householder Extensions 2020. This advises that front extensions should normally only be single-storey and that a two-storey front extension will only be acceptable if it relates to detached properties in large grounds.

7. I have given weight to the appellant's arguments in respect of there being two-storey gables on the front of other dwellings on Pridmore Close. In addition, I observed at my site visit that the proposed extensions would be screened when entering Pridmore Close by existing trees and other vegetation.
8. However, the scale and bulk of the proposed first-floor extension would be a dominant and overly large addition, that would be out of keeping and at odds with the prevailing character and appearance of both the streetscene and the existing dwelling. The extent of the projection at first-floor level would be greater than the projecting gables on other dwellings along Pridmore Close and it would be a discordant feature in the streetscene.
9. Regarding the single-storey side extension, I am not persuaded by the Council's concerns. Although, it would contrast with the existing dwelling in terms of its external materials and its flat roof, it would be a relatively discreet and subordinate addition.
10. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposal would conflict with the provisions of the Council's Core Strategy and with the advice contained in its Supplementary Planning Document. It would also conflict with the provisions of paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2023, which (amongst other things) seeks to ensure that new development adds quality to the area, is visually attractive and is sympathetic to local character.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, it is concluded that the appeal be dismissed.

Ian McHugh

INSPECTOR