



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 September 2022

by A.Graham BA(hons) MAued IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 February 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/M2840/D/22/3304369
60 Park Road, Wellingborough NN8 4QE

- 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 K Ahmed against the decision of North Northamptonshire Council.
 - The application Ref: NW/22/0230/FUL dated 6 April 2022, was refused by notice dated 25 May 2022.
 - The application is for erection of single storey first floor rear side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issue is the impact of the proposal upon the living conditions of neighbours.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a modern detached house within what is a mixed area on the periphery of the market town of Wellingborough. The appeal property stands within a row of similar properties that generally present pitched roof elevations towards generous open plan front gardens that adjoin Park Road itself.
4. To the rear most properties have generous rear gardens backing onto an area of woodland type planting that contains several larger scale, mature trees. Number 60 Park Road has previously been extended to the rear with a relatively sizeable conservatory extension that runs the entire width of the house. Behind this there appears to have been an original outshut extension that protrudes around 4.1m. This structure appears to have used similar materials to that of the principal house in its design.
5. The proposal before me seeks to build above this single storey element and as such would create a first floor extension above so as to create two new bedrooms along with a smaller, flat roof element with an ensuite to one of the bedrooms. The majority of the extension would be of a pitched roof construction and would present a gable elevation to the rear, although the more modest, en suite element would be of flat roof construction and slightly set back from this new rear gable. The conservatory would remain in its current location and the first floor extension would be set in from the

boundary by around 1 metre with a slight set down in the ridge. There would also be a new bedroom window inserted into the southern elevation that is proposed to be obscured glass.

6. The main issue within this appeal is the effect of the proposal upon the living conditions of residents in the adjoining property, number 58 Park Road. This property sits to the south of the appeal site but the layout and design of the plots means that the front elevation of number 58 is set forward of number 60. Accordingly, the rear elevation of this neighbouring property is therefore set back from the rear of number 60. Number 58 also has original windows to its side elevation that look out towards the appeal property.
7. In assessing this appeal, I consider that, despite its obvious attempts to set down and set in from the boundary, the proposal would result in a relatively large scale rear protrusion to this property that, although not directly causing any overshadowing issue, would create an element of over dominance upon the neighbours at number 58. Although, I do not consider that direct sunlight would be affected, the presence of this extension to the north would likely result in loss of northern daylight into the ground floor windows of number 58 and this would be exacerbated through the proposal not meeting the 45 Degree rule as suggested by the Council's Residential Extensions Design Guide¹ (SPG).
8. As such the proposal before me would fail to meet the guidance contained within the Council's SPG on residential extensions that aim to achieve such schemes that minimise or remove such impact upon resident's living conditions.
9. The proposed side elevation window would also serve an existing habitable bedroom and although this would be proposed to be obscured glass, I consider that there would still be the possibility for a loss of privacy due primarily to the existing side elevation windows of number 58 being so close. Moreover, I do not consider that the obscuring of such a window would create acceptable living conditions for future occupiers of this room and as such I consider it likely that efforts could be made to remove this obscure glazing at a later date.
10. In light of the above assessment therefore, the proposal before me would result in a rear protrusion that would be overly large, and dominant to those residents living at number 58 Park Road. As such the requirements of Policy 8 (e) (i) of the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) as well as the guidance on the importance of good design as included within the National Planning Policy Framework (The Framework).

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, and taking into account of all other matters raised, I dismiss the appeal.

A Graham

INSPECTOR

¹ Residential Extensions – A Guide to Good Design, Supplementary Design Guide (SPG) October 2002.