
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 January 2022

by D J Barnes MBA BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 08 February 2022.

Appeal Ref: APP/M2840/D/21/3287897

16 Francis Dickins Close, Wollaston NN29 7RH

- 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 Miss Hannah King against the decision of North Northamptonshire Council.
 - The application Ref NW/21/00838/FUL, dated 27 September 2021, was refused by notice dated 23 November 2021.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a two storey rear extension to the property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. It is considered that the main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the living standards of future occupiers of the appeal property.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a 2-storey dwelling situated within a primarily residential area. The proposed development includes a 2-storey extension to the property which would result in a bedroom window being erected within a side facing elevation. To avoid potential concerns about loss of privacy because the outlook from this habitable room would be towards the conservatory and rear garden of 18 Francis Dickins Close, the appeal scheme includes the erection of obscured glazing.
4. Although included as part of the originally submitted planning application but subsequently amended at the suggestion of the Planning Officer, it is no longer part of the proposed development before me that this side facing window be clear glazed in a similar manner to other schemes within the surrounding area, including at No. 20. I am required to determine the appeal based upon the scheme before me to consider.
5. The evidence refers to the Council's *Residential Extensions: A Guide to Good Design Supplementary Planning Guidance* which identifies that to protect the privacy of neighbouring occupiers obscured glazing may be acceptable in side walls where there are no alternative solutions. The evidence indicates that this *Guidance* does not differentiate between habitable and non-habitable rooms.

6. The proposed window would be the only external opening associated with the bedroom. By reason of the evidence provided by the appellant about the effect on levels of daylight associated with obscured glazing, sufficient levels of light would reach this habitable room so as not to have a materially detrimental effect on the living standards of the future occupiers.
7. However, the proposed bedroom would only have a single opening and, unlike a rooflight, an outlook from a window within a wall would be a reasonable expectation for occupiers of the property. Although the levels of daylight would be sufficient this matter is outweighed by the absence of a satisfactory outlook from the only window within the proposed bedroom.
8. It is acknowledged that the appellant may be content with the absence of an outlook from the proposed window. However, the appellant may well move away from the property at a later date and there is a need to ensure that any future occupiers would have satisfactory living standards.
9. For the reasons given, it is concluded that the proposed development would result in unsatisfactory living standards for the future occupiers of the appeal property and, as such, it would conflict with Policy 8e of the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy which seeks to protect amenity by development not resulting in an unacceptable impact on the amenities of future occupiers. There would also be a conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks a high standard of amenity for existing and future users. Accordingly, it is concluded that this appeal should be dismissed.

D J Barnes

INSPECTOR