
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 July 2017

by Richard Schofield BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

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

Decision date: 18th August 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/V2825/D/17/3177126
20 Reedhill, Northampton NN4 9UP

- 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 S Chauhan against the decision of Northampton Borough Council.
 - The application Ref N/2017/0081, dated 20 January 2017, was refused by notice dated 10 May 2017.
 - The development proposed is single storey rear extension including garage conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of the occupiers of 21 Reedhill (No 21), with regard to outlook.

Reasons

3. The outlook from the rear elevation of the dwelling at No 21 is open, looking across the large garden plots (including that of the appeal site) of the surrounding loose knit housing development. Although there is an awareness of the dwelling at 20 Reedhill (No 20), it does not impinge significantly on this outlook. The outlook from No 21's garden is similarly unencumbered.
4. The first floor rear windows of No 21 are situated under a roof overhang but this did not appear, from my site visit, to make any difference to the outlook from them, which would take in the full extent of the appeal proposal. Even if this were not the case, the outlook from the rear balcony would not be so encumbered.
5. The appeal proposal would introduce a substantial rear extension to the appeal dwelling. It would run for just over nine metres, parallel to, and around two metres from, the shared rear garden boundary with No 21. The eaves would rise above the boundary fence, albeit not by a significant amount, with a ridge height well above it.
6. The extent and height of the appeal proposal in such close proximity to the shared boundary could not fail, in my judgment, to introduce an intrusive and anomalous feature into the outlook from both the rear elevation and rear garden of No 21. It would detract from the appreciable sense of space and

openness afforded by the established pattern of development and would be oppressive upon the outlook from the rear garden. The slope of the roof away from the boundary would not have any appreciable mitigating effect, given the apex height and the length of the roofscape.

7. There is some planting within the garden of No 21, which might possibly obscure a short section of the appeal proposal, but one cannot rely on such planting being retained. Nor is it reasonable to expect the occupiers of No 21 to have to do so in order to block out views of a harmful development.
8. I conclude that the appeal proposal would have adverse effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of 21 Reedhill (No 21), with regard to outlook. It would conflict with policy S10 of the West Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy and policies E20 and H18 of the Northampton Local Plan. These seek, among other things, to ensure that new development adequately reflects the character of its surroundings in terms of siting; achieves the highest standards of sustainable design; and does not have an adverse effect upon adjoining properties.

Other Matters

9. It is suggested that the appeal proposal would improve the living conditions of current and future occupiers of No 20 by providing a much needed increase in floor space. There is not, however, any substantive evidence before me to indicate that such an extensive increase, to what is already a sizeable dwelling, is in any way essential.
10. Permitted development rights allow for rear extensions of a certain size. This proposal is, however, well in excess of such permitted development and the existence of such rights does not set any sort of precedent for it.

Conclusion

11. I conclude that the appeal proposal would conflict with the development plan when taken as a whole. For the reasons given above, and taking all other matters into consideration, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Richard Schofield

INSPECTOR