
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 April 2025 by T Morris BA (Hons) MSc

Decision by K L Robbie BA(Hons) DipTP MTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 JUNE 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/M2840/D/24/3357324

26 Clarence Court, Rushden, North Northamptonshire NN10 9HN

- 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 Roy Reynolds against the decision of North Northamptonshire Council.
 - The application Ref is NE/24/00651/FUL.
 - The development proposed is car port to front elevation.
-

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.

Preliminary Matter

3. The description of development within the banner heading above is taken from the original application form. However, I have corrected a spelling mistake to the word 'elevation' in the description provided on the application form.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the existing building and the surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. 26 Clarence Court is a semi-detached bungalow situated within an established residential area. Clarence Court features dwellings which are of varying appearance, albeit they have similarities in their materials with brick, render, roof tiles and facing tiles being predominant. Whilst the dwellings are typically setback from the street, some have flat roofed garages which project forward, including several opposite the appeal site. However, they appear to be original to the dwellings.
6. The proposed car port would span across a setback in the front elevation of the appeal property and extend part way across the main gabled front elevation. Its slightly mono-pitched roof would cut across the eaves of the property.
7. Due to its prominent location to the front of the appeal property, together with its considerable forward projection, the car port would be conspicuous in the street

scene. Whilst the car port would be built of materials common for this type of structure, its mono-pitched roof would have an awkward and jarring relationship with the dual-pitched roof and forward gable section of the existing building. Even accounting for the appeal property's location at the end of Clarence Court and its wider frontage than others in the street as well as its setback from the highway, the carport would be an incongruous feature in the street scene.

8. The appellant has referred to similar car ports in the Whitefriars area of Rushden including one on Clarence Court. However, from my observations on site this carport is mostly screened by a solid gate and fence and is not located on the front elevation of the property. It is not therefore directly comparable with the appeal proposal and therefore I cannot draw any parallels with it that would weigh in the appeal scheme's favour.
9. I therefore conclude that the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the existing building and the surrounding area. It would conflict with Policy 8 of the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy 2011-2031 (2016), Policy EN11 of the East Northamptonshire Local Plan Part 2 2011-2031 (2021) and Policy EN1 of the Rushden Neighbourhood Plan (2018). These require that development proposals respond positively to the site's context and character, create a continuity of street frontage in terms of appearance and use materials that respect and complement existing neighbourhood properties and those in the vicinity of the application site.

Other Matters

10. The Council's reason for refusal also states that the proposal would create a precedent for future similar proposals. Whether or not that be the case, I have considered the proposed development on its own merits, and it would be harmful for the site-specific reasons described.
11. I acknowledge that the carport would provide covered parking for elderly residents at the appeal property. However, whilst I accept that this may assist the occupiers of the property, it is also probable that the proposed development would remain long after the current personal circumstances cease to be relevant. For these reasons, I therefore find that this factor is not sufficient to justify the harm that the proposal would cause to the character and appearance of the existing building and the surrounding area.
12. Furthermore, the absence of objections from the town council, the local highways authority and local residents does not justify the harm of the proposal identified under the main issue and the resulting conflict with the development plan.

Conclusion and Recommendation

13. The proposed development would conflict with the development plan as a whole and there are no other considerations, including the provisions of the Framework, which would outweigh this finding. I therefore recommend that the appeal is dismissed.

T Morris

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

KL Robbie

INSPECTOR