
Appeal Decision

Site visits made on 30 September & 14 October 2019 by AJ Sutton BA Hons DipTP
DMS MRTPI

by R C Kirby BA Hons DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 November 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/Z2830/D/19/3233305

39 Hillside Crescent, Nether Heyford, NN7 3LS

- 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 Richard Lazenby against the decision of South Northants District Council.
 - The application Ref S/2019/0647/FUL, dated 24 March 2019, was refused by notice dated 21 May 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as 'Construct bedroom extension over existing garage on the side of the property, convert existing garage into playroom. Position pitched roof over washroom'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted to construct bedroom extension over existing garage on the side of the property, convert existing garage into playroom and position pitched roof over washroom at 39 Hillside Crescent, Nether Heyford, NN7 3LS in accordance with the terms of application Ref S/2019/0647/FUL dated 24 March 2019 and subject to the conditions below:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

Plan on Ground Floor - Proposed
Plan on First Floor - Proposed
Revised Proposed Elevation - Bin Store Added to Elevation, Revision A
Location/Site Plan 11 March 2019
 - 3) Notwithstanding condition 2 no development shall take place until details of the bin store have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
 - 4) The external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be constructed in materials matching those of the existing property.

Appeal Procedure

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

Preliminary Matters

3. The decision notice cites Section 7 of the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) relating to the vitality of town centres and as such, is not considered relevant to this decision. Reference was also made to the proposal not having due regard to the Council's Corporate Priorities, the details of which are not before me and have therefore not informed this decision.
4. A revised plan was submitted during the planning application process, which includes the addition of a single storey pitched roof bin store to be attached to the side elevation of the appeal property. The officer's report indicates that further details of the bin store were not accepted at this time as the Council was minded to refuse planning permission. I have considered all submitted plans before me in reaching this decision.

Main Issues

5. The main issues in this case are the effect of the proposal on:
 - the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area, and
 - the living conditions of the occupiers of No 37 Hillside Crescent, particularly with regard to outlook and light.

Reasons for Recommendations

6. The appeal property is a semi-detached dwelling, in a residential area at the edge of the rural settlement of Nether Heyford. The property is part of an inner island of terraced and semi-detached dwellings, formed by Hillside Road and Hillside Crescent, with properties on Hillside Road and the north east corner of Hillside Crescent enjoying an open outlook over a village green. Dwellings to the west including the appeal property, appear of a similar period whilst properties to the south and east of Hillside Crescent are later additions, individual in character and set in large plots.

Effect on Character & Appearance

7. The proposed extension would be modest in scale and would be subservient to the appeal property. The existing garage forms a straight building line with the principal elevation fronting the street. The proposed small bin store would continue this line and the first floor extension on the garage would reflect the appearance of the principal elevation of the property. As such the proposal would not be an incongruous addition and would not harm the appearance of the appeal property.
8. The appeal property is located near the junction with Hillside Road, with its southern boundary close to the bend of Hillside Crescent. However, it is not particularly prominent in the street scene. The proposed development would be located on the side elevation set back from the principal elevation ensuring that the appearance when viewed from the junction and wider views from across

the village green would be relatively unchanged. Furthermore, the appearance of the side elevation of the appeal property would be similar to that existing, when viewed from the bend of Hillside Crescent. Therefore, the proposed development would have a neutral effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

9. Whilst there would be glimpsed views of the proposed development when viewed from the rear from Hillside Road, the slight visual change would not significantly affect the existing sense of openness in the area. The reduced distance between the appeal property and No 37 resulting from the development would not be at odds with the existing street scene, where the plan form is characterised by different size gaps and spaces between dwellings. Furthermore, the appearance of the paired properties (host dwelling and No 41 Hill Crescent) would not be unbalanced by the proposal given the nature of the proposed development, varying plot sizes and shapes and the existing extension at No 41.
10. In light of the above, I conclude that the proposed extension would not harm the appearance of the host property and would have a neutral effect on the character and appearance of the area. The proposal would be consistent with the aims of Policies G3(A), H17 and EV1 of the South Northamptonshire Local Plan 2014 (Local Plan) and the South Northamptonshire Council Supplementary Planning Guidance 'Residential Extensions' (SPG) which collectively seek development to be compatible in terms of type, scale, design and materials with the existing character of the locality, with extensions respecting the scale and character of the existing dwelling and of neighbouring development. Furthermore, the proposal would not be contrary to Framework and Planning Practice Guidance in respect to achieving well designed places.

Effects on Living Conditions

11. The outlook from the first floor window on the side elevation of No 37 is partially obscured by the pitched roof of the existing single storey extension at this property. This in itself limits the view of the appeal property and restricts light from the west. It was observed that the existing open view to the north from this window would be unaltered by the development.
12. Whilst the existing acute angle formed by the properties respective side elevations would be narrowed by the proposed development, resulting in a distance less than that advised in the SPG, the existing offset configuration of the properties would ensure that the development would not appear overbearing on the outlook from this window which serves a bedroom. Nor would the proposed first floor extension result in a loss of light to No 37's side window because of its position relative to the side wall of this property and the north eastern orientation of its side elevation.
13. In light of the foregoing, I conclude that the proposal would not affect the outlook from the side window serving No 37, nor would it result in a loss of light to the degree that would make the room that this window serves less pleasant to use. The proposal, therefore, accords with the aims of Policies G3(D) and H17 of the Local Plan and guidance in the SPG which seek to prevent development that unacceptably harms the amenities of any neighbouring properties or results in a significant loss of amenity to neighbouring occupiers.

Other Matters

14. My attention has been drawn to a planning application which was refused permission for a similar development at the adjoining property. However, no details in respect of this proposal have been submitted for me to assess and this therefore limits the weight that I can give this matter in my consideration of the appeal before me. In any event, each planning application and appeal must be considered on its individual merits.

Conditions

15. In addition to conditions addressing statutory requirements and to ensure that the development is constructed as approved, for certainty and in the interests of the character and appearance of the area and dwelling, conditions controlling external materials and the details of the bin store are necessary.

Conclusion and Recommendation

16. For the reasons outlined above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed with the suggested conditions.

A J Sutton

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

17. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on this basis the appeal is allowed with the conditions set out above.

RC Kirby

INSPECTOR