



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 February 2023

by R Jones BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7th March 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/W2845/W/22/3309476

21 Portland Place, Northampton NN1 4DH

- 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 Rakib Ali against the decision of West Northamptonshire Council.
 - The application Ref WNN/2022/0566, dated 11 May 2022, was refused by notice dated 26 September 2022.
 - The development proposed is garden shed/outbuilding for storage purposes and back gate 2.47m.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The planning application was made retrospectively and I have dealt with the appeal on that basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this case is the effect of the garden shed/outbuilding and back gate on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. No.21 Portland Place (No.21) is a three-storey dwelling at the end of a terrace of properties sited parallel to Portland Place. The surrounding area has a tight urban grain and No.21 has a small rear garden that overlaps the neighbouring property to the south.
5. Within the garden is an existing lean-to extension with a shallow pitched roof and an outbuilding has been constructed between this and the rear boundary of No.21. The outbuilding is around 6m in width extending almost the full width of the rear elevation of the host dwelling save for a gap of less than 1m. Within this gap, a close boarded timber gate of around 2.47m in height has been built providing access to the garden. The outbuilding has a flat roof and is around 2.8m in height, with grey external cladding.
6. The guidance at paragraph 7.18 of the Council's *Residential Extensions and Alterations Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2011)* (SPD) is that outbuildings between a house and a road, in most cases, are likely to appear as overly prominent features and should generally be avoided. They

should also be of an appropriate scale. Although not adjacent the road, there is a footway that runs along the northern (flank) elevation of No.21 which provides pedestrian access to a number of other dwellings on Portland Place. Because of its width and height, the outbuilding is very visible above the existing brick wall on the northern boundary of No.21 and as a consequence is unduly prominent from this footway and the green open space that adjoins it to the rear. Although I observed the urban grain to be tight, the size of the outbuilding means that visually it all but consumes the rear garden of the host property resulting in an overly cramped form of development.

7. I note that many dwellings have been altered and that there are various examples of boundary treatments in the surrounding area. However, I did not find outbuildings of a similar scale to that at No.21 to be characteristic of Portland Place, nor do I find the alterations referred to by the appellant justify or support the development before me. Consequently, on the main issue I conclude that the outbuilding and back gate cause harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
8. In addition to the conflict with the SPD guidance, there is also conflict with paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework, Policy S10 of the West Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy Local Plan (Part 1) (2014) and saved policies E20 and H18 of the Northampton Local Plan 1993-2006 (1997). Taken together, these require development to be of the highest standards of design that reflects local character, and is in keeping with the appearance of the surroundings.

Conclusions

9. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

R Jones

INSPECTOR