



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 December 2024

by K E Down MA(Oxon) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13th December 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/W2845/D/24/3349350

21 Wisley Close, Northampton, NN4 0XJ

- 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 Mr Ajet Tocilla against the decision of West Northamptonshire Council.
 - The application Ref is 2024/1459/FULL.
 - The development proposed is a first floor side extension and rear ground floor extension and roof terrace above.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural matters

2. The proposed roof terrace which is included in the description of development above was deleted from the proposed development during the application process and revised plans were submitted. This does not therefore form a part of the development subject to this appeal.
3. The Council is satisfied that the proposed single storey rear extension would have no adverse effect on the character or appearance of the host dwelling or on the surrounding area and would not harm the living conditions of neighbours. I agree with these views and will therefore restrict my further consideration to the proposed first floor side extension.

Main Issue

4. There is one main issue which is the effect of the proposed first floor side extension on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site comprises a two storey dwelling on a modern estate. There are broadly three house types in the vicinity of the appeal dwelling. Many dwellings have undergone extension but there remains a consistency of scale and design in the street scene. The appeal dwelling has gable ends to each side elevation and a single storey double garage to one side. This also ends in a gable to the side elevation. The dwelling is characterised by a prominent, two storey front gabled feature which projects forward at first floor and has a ground floor bay

window. It is rendered and painted whereas the majority of the dwelling is of red brick, thus giving it additional prominence.

6. The proposed extension would be a similar first floor gable fronted projection and since the aim is to provide symmetry I do not find that the lack of a set down from the main ridge unacceptable. However, the extension would be the full width of the double garage and therefore wider than the existing front gable. Moreover, the eaves would be below the existing eaves and at ground floor the garage door would be replaced by a window that would be flush with the façade. The result would be an extension that was similar in form but differently proportioned and different in detailed design from the existing front gable. The effect, rather than adding symmetry as suggested by the appellant, would be to give the dwelling a lopsided, poorly proportioned appearance that would be out of keeping with the host dwelling and the street scene of Wisley Close.
7. From the side, the proposed extension would be clearly visible in the street scene owing to it facing towards the rear gardens of dwellings in Rosemoor Drive, and to the position of the dwelling near to the entrance to Wisley Close. The extension would extend only part way back along the side elevation and have a level side eave, rather than a gable end. It would therefore appear disjointed and at odds with the gable ended elevation of the existing dwelling. The contrived roof form and blank rear wall, extending almost to ridge height would be particularly visible from the rear and would be seen from dwellings in Rosemoor Drive.
8. Overall, the proposed extension would therefore fail to respect either the proportions or design of the original dwelling. Its prominence in the street scene would only serve to emphasise its incongruous appearance.
9. The appellant refers to a number of other extensions nearby. Some are not comparable with the appeal proposal, being of a different design and/or on different original house types. At 12 Wisley Close there are similarities but the new front gable has been set in from the side elevation so that it matches the width of the original gable, providing pleasing symmetry at first floor. At 7 Rosemoor Drive the first floor gable is the full width of the double garage, which has been retained at ground floor. In my view this results in it appearing out of proportion with and dominating the original dwelling. Nevertheless, the side elevation facing the street is sympathetic to the original dwelling, finishing in a matching gable end. I do not therefore find that this example is comparable with or would justify allowing the proposed development.
10. It is concluded on the main issue that the proposed first floor side extension would have a materially detrimental effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. In consequence, it would conflict with Policy S10 of the West Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy, 2014, Policy Q1 of the Northampton Local Plan Part 2, 2011-2029, 2023, the National Planning Policy Framework and the Council's Residential Extensions and Alterations Design Guide (SPD), 2011. Taken together and amongst other things these expect extensions to protect, conserve and enhance the natural and built environment through high quality, beautiful and sustainable design that responds to and enhances locally distinct townscape. In particular, the SPD expects extensions to respect the form, design and proportions of the existing house with a roof that compliments the existing appearance.

11. For the reasons set out above and having regard to all other matters raised, including the lack of harm to the living conditions of neighbours and the lack of objection to the single storey rear extension, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

KE Down

INSPECTOR