



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 17 November 2020 by S Watson BA(Hons) MSc MRTPI

Decision by R C Kirby BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 November 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/V2825/D/20/3258219

32 Belfry Lane, Northampton NN4 0PB

- 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 Edward Parker against the decision of Northampton Borough Council.
 - The application Ref N/2020/0431, dated 16 April 2020, was refused by notice dated 12 June 2020.
 - The development proposed is double storey front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was carried out 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 main issue in this case is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and street scene.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is near the end of Belfry Lane, a cul-de-sac characterised by large houses set back from the road in spacious plots. The houses in the street are varied and there is little uniformity between properties. The appeal site itself contains a detached two-storey house with a large two-storey front projection. I note that there are number of properties in the surrounding area which have forward projections or detached garages in front of the house. However, these are predominantly set back from the road, giving the area an open, spacious character.
5. The proposal would be a substantial addition to the front of the existing dwelling, however I consider its design, materials and scale to be in keeping with the character and appearance of it. Harm to the host property would not result.
6. However, the new extension would extend out significantly into an area which is important for its contribution to the open character of the street. It would result in a prominent, intrusive, alien feature in the streetscene, introducing a tall, solid mass of brickwork into the cul-de-sac which would erode the

openness of the area and reduce views of the end of the cul-de-sac and the dwellings therein.

7. The appellant has drawn my attention to a recent planning permission for a first-floor extension at No 30, however no details of the extension have been provided. I therefore do not know what has been approved, or whether the circumstances of this case are directly comparable to the scheme before me. Accordingly, I am unable to attach weight to this matter in my consideration of this case. Nevertheless, all development proposals must be considered on their own merit.
8. In light of the above, I conclude that the proposed extension would harm the character and appearance of the street scene, and would conflict with Policies E20 and H18 of the *Northampton Local Plan* and Policy S10 of the *West Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy: Local Plan Part 1* which, amongst other things, require development to reflect the character of its surroundings and be of a suitable design with a strong sense of place. The proposal would also conflict with the guidance on front extensions contained within the *Residential Extensions and Alterations Design Guide* supplementary planning document and the high-quality design requirements of Paragraph 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Other Matters

9. The appellant has raised that there were only a limited number of objections submitted by third parties in relation to the proposal. While I note that this may be the case, a lack of objections from third parties in itself does not justify harmful development. I have noted the concerns raised regarding the impact on living conditions for the occupiers of No 30 Belfry Lane, and the lack of permeable surfacing proposed. However, as the appeal is to be dismissed, I find it unnecessary to explore these matters further.

Recommendation

10. For the reasons given above I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

S Watson

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

11. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and concur that the appeal should be dismissed.

RC Kirby

INSPECTOR