The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 August 2019 by G Sibley MPLAN MRTPI

Decision by A U Ghafoor BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 August 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/V2825/D/19/3229094
116 Church Way, Northampton NN3 3BQ

- 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 John Chattell against the decision of Northampton Borough Council.
- The application Ref: N/2019/0040, dated 8 January 2019, was refused by notice dated 25 February 2019.
- The development proposed is two storey front extension.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The effect of the proposed development upon: (1) the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene; and 2) the living conditions of the occupiers of no.118 Church Way with regard to outlook and daylight.

Reasons for the Recommendation - *Character and appearance*

4. No. 116 is a two-storey dwelling with a single storey side garage and porch that are set forward of the house. The area that the extension would extend into is currently the front garden and the turning area for the driveway. This area is open, undeveloped and contributes positively to the suburban character of the street scene. The houses in the street typically have large front gardens and are characterised by two styles of properties. One of which is the two-storey dwellings with a cat-slide roof, and the second is the plain two storey properties, which includes no. 116. Some of the plain two storey properties have their gable fronting the road.

5. The plans show that the proposed two storey extension would extend about 6 m forward of the host property and 4 m forward of the garage and porch and would almost double the depth of the host building. The inclusion of a gable projection to the dwelling would not necessarily harm the integrity of the host dwelling, and there are examples of them in the area. However, the two-storey front extension would significantly change the design and layout of the host dwelling. Due to the size and location of the extension it would not appear subservient to the host building and would harm its external appearance.

6. The two-storey front extension would extend a considerable amount into the front garden which would appear out-of-keeping with the character of the street scene. It would visually

harm its appearance. In addition, the plans show that the first floor of the extension would be rendered. This is not a commonly used material on dwellings within the street, with many of the properties using UPVC cladding on the first floor. As such, its use would result in incongruous development.

7. I find that the development would have a visually harmful effect upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling and street scene given the size, location and materials proposed. Accordingly, it would fail to comply with Policies E20 and H18 of the Northampton Local Plan (LP) and Policy S10 of the West Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy Local Plan (Part 1). The proposed development would also be contrary to the Residential Extensions and Alterations Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).

Living conditions

8. As I have said elsewhere, the two-storey extension would project forward of the host dwelling by around 6 m. The opening on the side elevation of no. 118 is what appears to be a bathroom window and there is an approximate 2.5 m separation distance between the two dwellings. Despite this, the adjacent building is set back slightly behind no. 116 and has a dormer window on the cat-slide roof. The proposed extension would project a significant distance beyond the dormer window. It would also fall foul of the 45-degree code, which is at odds with guidance found in the SPD. The proposed extension would overshadow the dormer window, and this would have a detrimental impact upon the occupiers' outlook and would limit the amount of daylight it would receive. I find that, due to the height, bulk and location of the proposed extension it would appear overbearing and would harm the living conditions of the occupiers of no. 118 through the impact it would have on their outlook and the loss of daylight. Therefore, the proposed development would be contrary to Policies E20 and H18 of the LP and the SPD.

Other Matters

9. The appellants have referred to an application that was approved to extend no. 116. However, that scheme would have extended the property over the garage on the right-hand side of the dwelling and included a new single storey garage. The latter was in about the same location as the appeal extension. The garage would have been below the height of the dormer window and, as such, it is unlikely that it would have harmed outlook from no. 118. It would have appeared subservient to the host dwelling. The two schemes are not directly comparable, and, in any event, circumstances have changed. Limited weight is given to the previous planning permission and history.

Conclusion and Recommendation

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

G Sibley

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

11. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report, and, on that basis, I too agree that the appeal should be dismissed.

A U Ghafoor

INSPECTOR