
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 August 2020 by John Gunn DipTP Dip DBE MRTPI

Decision by R C Kirby BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8 September 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/V2825/D/20/3246616

25 Beechwood Road, Northampton NN5 6JT

- 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 Paul Blandford against the decision of Northampton Borough Council.
 - The application Ref N/2019/1425, dated 12 November 2019, was refused by notice dated 15 January 2020.
 - The development proposed is single storey rear extension, loft conversion with dormers and detached garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for single storey rear extension, loft conversion with dormers and detached garage at 25 Beechwood Road, Northampton NN5 6JT in accordance with the terms of application Ref N/2019/1425, dated 12 November 2019, and the following condition:
 1. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved drawings: site location plan Drwg No BLA/330/SUR/010, floor plans, elevations and site plan as proposed Drwg No BLA/330/PA/010 and elevations as proposed Drwg No BLA/330/PA/020.

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.

Preliminary Matter

3. The description of development in the heading above has been taken from the planning application form. However, in Part E of the appeal form it is stated that the description of development has not changed but, nevertheless, a different wording has been entered. In particular I note that the amended description makes reference to 'part retrospective'. This is not an act of development and accordingly, I have used the description given on the original application.

Main Issue

4. The Council's delegated report makes clear that the rear dormer window and rear detached garage are the same as those previously found acceptable when it granted planning permission for application ref N/2019/0421. In this regard, and from my observations on my site visit, I find that these parts of the development are acceptable and accord with the development plan.
5. Having regard to the above, the main issue in this case is the effect of the single storey rear extension on the living conditions of the occupiers of No 27 Beechwood Road, having particular regard to outlook and light.

Reasons for the Recommendation

6. The single storey rear extension runs along the common boundary between the host property and No 27, and projects beyond the rear of this property. It is accepted by both parties that the single storey extension 'as built' is approximately 1 metre deeper than the development approved under planning permission reference N/2019/0421.
7. From my site visit I saw that the extension was visible from both the lounge and kitchen window and French doors of No 27, in close proximity. Taken with the rearward projection of No 27, the extension has resulted in a tunnelling effect upon the kitchen and lounge window.
8. However, the tunnelling effect that has resulted is not materially different to that which has previously found to be acceptable by the Council. Other than the increased depth, the floor level and design of the extension is very similar to the extant scheme. As a consequence and given the position of the kitchen and living room windows relative to the side of the extension, the outlook from them is likely to be the same as that previously found acceptable. The additional rearward projection of the extension over that previously found to be acceptable would be unlikely to be discernible on the outlook from these windows.
9. The new extension is sited further away from the French doors to the rear of No 27 than the windows referred to above. Although visible from the doors the outlook from them is largely down the long rear garden of No 27. The presence of the extension is unlikely to have made the room that these doors serve less pleasant to use as a result.
10. In light of the foregoing I find that the rear extension is not harmful to the living conditions of the occupiers of No 27 in terms of outlook. Moreover, given the height and siting of the extension I am satisfied that it has no greater impact on light entering the kitchen or living room of No 27 over that previously found acceptable by the Council when it granted permission for the single storey rear extension on the site.
11. Accordingly, I conclude that harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of No 27 has not occurred as a result of the new extension. There is no conflict with Policies H18 and E20 of the Northampton Local Plan, Policy H5 of the Duston Neighbourhood Plan – Made Version December 2015, the Northampton

Borough Council's Residential Extensions and Alterations Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document and the Framework which jointly seek that a high standard of amenity is provided for existing and future users.

Other Matter

12. The Council's delegated Officer report indicates that the appeal site lies just outside the Duston Conservation Area. They conclude that the impact of the development on the setting of this heritage asset would be neutral. In this regard I have no reason to disagree with their view.

Conditions

13. The Council has suggested several conditions it would wish to see imposed in the event that the appeal was allowed. I have considered these against the guidance set out in the Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance.
14. Although substantially complete, a condition is required to ensure that it is completed in accordance with the approved plans, for certainty. Whilst the Council have requested a materials condition, I found that the materials used within the extension, the dormer and the garage were similar to the host property, and consequently I do not see the necessity for such a condition.

Recommendation

15. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed subject to the condition set out above.

J Gunn

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

16. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed with the recommended condition.

RC Kirby

INSPECTOR