



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 April 2025 by S Jamieson BA (Hons) MPlan

Decision by M Russell BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12th May 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W2845/D/25/3360218

40 Romany Road, Northampton NN2 7DJ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Mr Wouter Vat't klooster against the decision of West Northamptonshire Council.
- The application Ref is 2024/3610/FULL.
- The development proposed is described as '2 storey rear extension and internal alterations'.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Procedural Matter

3. Notwithstanding the description of development set out above, which is taken from the application form, it is clear from the plans and accompanying details that the proposals also include a covered decking area. The Council dealt with the proposal on this basis and so shall I.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on:
 - a) the character and appearance of the area; and
 - b) the living conditions of occupiers of 38 and 42 Romany Road (No 38 and No 42), with particular regard to outlook.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Character and appearance

5. The appeal site is a mid-terrace property, situated in a residential area which predominately comprises two-storey dwellings of traditional design. Whilst there is a limited degree of variation in design and façade treatments, dwellings are commonly red brick or rendered and arranged in short, terraced blocks. These terraced blocks are more often bookended by two-storey projections to the front and rear of the end terrace dwellings. Some dwellings have been extended to the rear. However, such additions are typically modest in scale with materials reflecting their hosts and the local vernacular. Garden sizes are also generous, and the side

orientation of the gardens which adjoin the back of this part of Romany Road give a spaciousness to the rear garden environment. These factors give order and consistency to the area making a positive contribution to its character and appearance.

6. The combined scale and footprint of the ground and first-floor rear extension and covered decking area would dominate the rear elevation of the host dwelling. In combination with their irregular shape and contemporary detailing, which includes timber cladded walls and roof and a large first-floor window, they would appear incongruous amongst the simple traditional architecture of the terrace and the generally more modest scale of extensions on nearby dwellings. In addition, they would detract from the balance of the rear elevation of the wider bookended terrace.
7. I accept that the extension would not be visible from Romany Road. Even so, limited public visibility does not obviate the need for good design and the development would be clearly evident from the windows and rear gardens of neighbouring properties to the side and rear of the appeal site.
8. While timber facing materials may be commonplace for garden buildings, timber clad two-storey buildings are not characteristic of the area. The render applied to some neighbouring properties is also not comparable. The appellant suggests that they would be agreeable to a planning condition relating to the use of materials. However, no examples of alternative materials have been put forward and this would not in any case ensure that the combined scale and irregular form of the proposals would effectively assimilate the proposal with the host dwelling and its immediate surroundings.
9. The proposed extension would therefore have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. In this regard, it would conflict with Policy Q1 of the Northampton Local Plan Part 2 (2023) and Policy S10 of the West Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy Local Plan – Part 1 (2014) which require high standards of design for new developments and that developments protect, conserve and enhance the built environment.
10. For the same reasons, there would also be conflict with the design guidance contained in the Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (December 2011) and paragraph 139 of the National Planning Policy Framework (December 2024).

Living conditions

11. There is a single storey rear extension at No 38, which abuts the appeal site. There is a rear facing window in this elevation, that is not shown on the submitted drawings but is referenced in the appellant's report and was visible when I visited the site. Notwithstanding this discrepancy, only the proposed decking and open sided canopy would project beyond this window. As such, there would be no material loss of outlook when experienced from the neighbouring extension at No 38.
12. There would be views of the side elevation of the two-storey element from the first-floor window on the rear projecting gable at No 38. However, due to the intervening distance and relative angle between the window and the proposed development, the outlook across the rear garden and beyond would be largely

unobstructed. Indeed, it is common ground between the main parties that in this regard, the proposal accords with the 45-degree code contained in the Council's Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), which is a tool designed to establish whether a development would give rise to a loss of outlook from habitable windows of adjoining properties.

13. In terms of the two smaller first and second floor rear elevation windows at No 38 which sit nearest to the boundary with the appeal site, it is common ground between the parties that outlook from these openings is already restricted by the rear projections at No 38 and that these windows are not principal windows serving main habitable rooms. From the evidence before me and my own observations on site, I find no reason to disagree and therefore any effect on outlook from these windows would likely be limited.
14. Whilst there would be a degree of change in terms of how surrounding built form is experienced from the rear garden of No 38, the current single storey extension at No 38 means that the bulkier elements of the proposals would be set back from this neighbouring garden area. Coupled with the existing boundary fence and pleached trees, both of which would provide some screening of the proposed development, suitable outlook from the garden at No 38 would be maintained.
15. The dwelling at No 42 has not been extended to the rear and there are a number of window openings in the rear elevation of this neighbouring dwelling which have a spacious aspect over its generous rear garden. The second storey element of the proposal would be set away from the shared boundary with this neighbouring dwelling and the single storey elements would include a pitched roof and open sides to the canopy over the decking area. Consequently, the proposals would not lead to any unacceptable loss of outlook from the windows or garden serving this neighbouring dwelling and the submitted drawings also demonstrate that the 45-degree code in the SPD would be met.
16. I conclude therefore that the proposed development would not have a harmful effect on the living conditions of No 38 and No 42, with particular regard to outlook. In that regard it would comply with the requirements in Policy Q2 of the Northampton Local Plan Part 2 (March 2023) to protect residential amenity.

Conclusion and Recommendation

17. I have found that the proposal would not harm neighbouring living conditions. However, it would harm the character and appearance of the area and would conflict with the development plan in that regard. Therefore, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

S Jamieson

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

18. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

M Russell

INSPECTOR