
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 April 2017

by Rachael A Bust BSc (Hons) MA MSc LLM MEnvSci MInstLM MCMI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 8th May 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/V2825/D/17/3169274
64 Falcutt Way, Northampton NN2 8PH

- 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 Bryan Haynes against the decision of Northampton Borough Council.
 - The application Ref N/2016/1302, dated 27 September 2016, was refused by notice dated 29 November 2016.
 - The development proposed is a side first floor extension above garage and rear ground floor extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the surrounding area and the appeal property.

Reasons

3. Falcutt Way is a residential street within a suburban estate where properties are set back from the road with open frontages. The appeal property No 64 is located within a part of the street where the majority of properties are detached and have a distinctive gable end front elevation. Some of the detached properties have been extended, but there are still notable gaps in between them. The property design and gaps contribute to the character and appearance of this part of the street.
4. The appeal property shares a section of road frontage with the substantially extended No 62 Falcutt Way. The two properties are already linked at the ground floor level as the garage of No 64 shares a common boundary wall with a habitable room of No 62. This has already resulted in a change in character of these two properties. The only remaining visual separation between the two properties is at the first floor level between the existing side elevation of No 64 and the side extension of No 62.
5. The scale and proportion of the proposed extension would appear to fill much of the only remaining visible gap at the first floor level between No 64 and No 62. It would be prominent from the street and would harm the visual separation between the two properties. Consequently I find that this would harm the character and appearance of this section of the street. The extension

- would add to the existing bulk and massing of No 64 and No 62, whereby the two properties would cease to be viewed as being separate.
6. I note that the appellant considers that no harm would arise to the street scene because the existing first floor extension at No 62 is already set back from the front elevation by approximately 3 metres and at least a 1 metre gap would remain between the proposed and existing first floor extensions. However, because of the limited nature of these gaps I find they would not allow for sufficient and adequate visual separation between the two properties and consequently would not overcome the harm that I have identified.
 7. Moreover, in relation to the effect on No 64 the proposed first floor side extension would not be subordinate and would be dominant to the host property. The scale and proportion would unbalance and reduce the prominence of the distinctive gable end front elevation and therefore harming the character and appearance of No 64.
 8. I conclude that the first floor side extension would cause significant and unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the area and the appeal property. Consequently, this part of the appeal proposal would be contrary to saved Policies E20 and H18 of the Northampton Local Plan (NLP) adopted 1997 that require the design and appearance of new extensions to reflect the character and appearance of the original dwelling and its surroundings including form and scale; and sustainable design principles of Policy S10 of the West Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (WNJCS) adopted December 2014.
 9. The appellant has made reference to side extensions constructed at other properties on Falcutt Way. Although no details have been provided to me I did view these other properties on my site visit but I did not find them to demonstrate sufficiently similar characteristics to this appeal. I have, in any case, reached my own conclusions on the appeal proposal on the basis of the evidence before me.
 10. The proposed rear ground floor extension would not visible from the public realm. The design and choice of materials are acceptable. I find no harm would result from this rear extension to the character and appearance of the area and the appeal property. Consequently, this part of the appeal proposal would not conflict with the saved Policies E20 and H18 of the NLP, Policy S10 of the WNJCS.

Conclusion

11. I have found that there would be significant and unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the area and the appeal property from the first floor side extension; this outweighs my findings in relation to the ground floor rear extension. Consequently on balance the overall scheme does not succeed and the appeal is dismissed.

Rachael A. Bust

INSPECTOR