



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 October 2022

by K Ford MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 November 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/W2845/W/22/3300411

10 Cumberland Close, Northampton, Northamptonshire NN3 2AD

- 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 D Summerfield against the decision of West Northamptonshire Council.
 - The application Ref WNN/2022/0341, dated 18 March 2022, was refused by notice dated 25 April 2022.
 - The development proposed is new detached motorcycle store to front of dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a corner plot location at the end of a turning head in a residential cul de sac. Properties in the vicinity are generally set back from the road behind driveways and front gardens. There are no outbuildings to the front of properties.
4. The outbuilding would be positioned adjacent to the gable end wall of the neighbouring property. Despite the choice of materials and roof height, the development would not blend with the immediate surroundings, as suggested by the appellant. It would be clearly distinguishable as a separate building.
5. The prominent location means that it would be readily apparent within the streetscene. It would be an incongruous and dominating structure at odds with the general pattern of development. The proposed planting would do little to screen the development and ameliorate the harm.
6. The development would harm the character and appearance of the area and therefore would conflict with the part of Policy E20 of the Northampton Local Plan which requires new development to reflect the character of the surroundings in terms of amongst other things, siting. It would also conflict with the part of Policy S10 of the West Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy Local Plan (Part 1) which requires development to protect, conserve and enhance the built environment.

Other Matters

7. I note the appellant's reference to the retention of parking to the front of the dwelling for 4 vehicles. Be that as it may, it does not outweigh the harm identified.
8. The appellant identifies that there has been a lot of changes to Home Farm House which has changed the streetscene. I disagree that this sets a precedent given that the nature of the development is different to that proposed. In any event, each case is determined on its own merits and my assessment is based on the evidence before me.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons identified, I conclude that the appeal is dismissed.

K Ford

INSPECTOR