



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 November 2024

by David Troy BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2 December 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/M2840/D/24/3353173

106 Deeble Road, Kettering, Northants NN15 5HW

- 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 Ms Farzana Kausar against the decision of North Northamptonshire Council.
 - The application Ref is NK/2024/0291.
 - The development proposed is two storey side extension and garage conversion into habitable space with a pitched roof extension to rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed side extension on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two storey end-terrace dwelling with a single storey extension to the side and a small single storey porch and canopy projecting from the front of the property. It is located in a mature well-established residential area characterised by a mixture of properties of varied styles and design set back from the road behind front gardens/driveways. No. 106 Deeble Road being situated on a corner plot has even more expansive grounds, which add to the open character and appearance of the street scene.
4. The appeal proposal would involve the construction of a first floor extension over the side extension in line with the existing front elevation of the main house and conversion of a detached garage into habitable space at the rear. The proposed first floor extension would be set back from the public highway behind a boundary wall running along the side of the site and would be constructed with a gabled tiled roof to match the existing property.
5. The appeal property is on a relatively spacious plot and as such the extension would not appear overlarge, relative to the overall plot size. The scale and form of the proposed first floor extension built to the side of the main house would nevertheless still be a significant addition relative to the main property. As such, although set back from the side boundary, the proposed extension would result in substantial bulk at the side of the main dwelling that would be out of character with the more modest form and appearance of the host building and would compromise the sense of space and openness in the area.

6. These shortcomings would be exacerbated by the proposal's prominent position, where the proposed first floor extension would be visible from a number of public vantage points along Deeble Road and Church Way. The proposed first floor extension, by virtue of its scale, siting and design, would fail to achieve an appropriate degree of subordination to the host property. As such, I consider that the proposed extension would result in an incongruous and out-of-keeping addition that would cause unacceptable harm to the character of the area.
7. I have considered the appellant's arguments that the design and layout of the proposed development has been carefully considered in order to minimise any impacts on the area and to respect the prevailing building line. Whilst the use of matching materials, fenestrations and the boundary treatment would assist with integrating the proposal with the host property and the area, these aspects do not overcome the adverse effects outlined above.
8. Consequently, I conclude that the proposed side extension would adversely harm the character and appearance of the area. It is contrary to Policy 8 of the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy 2016 which, amongst other things, seek to ensure that development proposals respond to the local character and characteristics of the site's immediate and wider context.

Other Matters

9. I have noted the other developments drawn to my attention by the appellant and the Council. However, the side extensions at Nos. 211 and 213 St Johns Road and new dwelling at No. 140 St Johns Road are of a different scale and form to the appeal scheme. As such, whilst I have taken these other examples into account, they do not materially alter my conclusions on the appeal proposal.
10. I note the appellant's comments regarding the context provided in the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) for good design and the opportunities to support the effective use of airspace above existing residential properties to meet the needs of the residents, but I find that the development does not achieve the standards the Framework seeks.
11. The appellant considers the proposal would constitute a sustainable form of development in line with the requirements of the Framework. I have considered the various benefits put forward by the appellant that the proposal would bring arising from the effective use of land, contributing to the local economy through additional building work and increased Council tax receipts and meeting the appellant's accommodation needs. While I have given them some weight in favour of the appeal, these benefits would not be sufficient to outweigh the harm I have identified. For all these reasons, there are no other material considerations to outweigh the development plan conflicts identified.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

David Troy

INSPECTOR