



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 June 2023

by Sarah Colebourne MA, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 03 July 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/M2840/D/23/3319199

252 Newton Road, Rushden, Northamptonshire, NN10 0SY

- 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 and Mrs Alexander and Martha Anum-Addo & Owusu-Achiaw against the decision of North Northamptonshire Council.
 - The application Ref NE/22/01577/FUL, dated 9 December 2022, was refused by notice dated 17 February 2023.
 - The development proposed is described as a 'ground floor rear extension and replace two existing Velux windows with two large Velux'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Reasons

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character of the dwelling. The development plan includes policy 8 d) i) and ii) of the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (CS) which seeks to ensure that development responds to the site's context. National policy in the National Planning Policy Framework has a similar objective and seeks to encourage good design.
3. The appeal site comprises a large, detached chalet style dwelling which is located on Newton Road within a small group of dwellings of varying sizes and styles that are surrounded by open countryside. It is set back from the road behind the two dwellings either side of its access and sits within an extremely large and predominantly private plot in which there are also a number of outbuildings. The dwelling comprises a central main section with a steeply pitched crown roof. To either side there is an annex and a garage which have lower pitched roofs and appear as smaller, subsidiary elements which break up the extent of the building resulting in an attractive dwelling of a domestic scale and character.
4. The proposed single storey, flat roofed extension would extend to the side of the dwelling behind the existing garage and would replace a small extension and barbeque area to provide a cinema and games room. It would also extend the dwelling to the rear by some 23.8m to provide a swimming pool. This would have three roof lanterns and would be some 11m wide, extending the dwelling further to the side.
5. The character of a building is not dependent on whether it can be seen from elsewhere but in any case, and despite its large, mostly private plot, this

extension would not be completely screened from the neighbouring dwelling at no 256. The removal of a tree on the boundary with no 256 would open it up to views from there and the 31m total length of the extension would be clearly apparent. Despite its low height of 3.5m, the 23m projection beyond the existing dwelling would appear excessively out of scale with the existing 16m depth of the dwelling and this would be seen from both within the appeal site and from no 256.

6. At 11m in width, the extension would be only 3m less than the width of the main, central part of the dwelling and wider than either the annex or the garage elements. In extending beyond the side elevation of the existing garage, it would also have an awkward relationship with the dwelling. As such, it would appear overly dominant on the rear elevation when seen from within the appeal site.
7. I have noted that the Council's Householder Extension Supplementary Planning Document (2020) provides for longer rear extensions on large sites but such proposals must also meet the relevant criteria within the policies of the CS.
8. In terms of its size and scale then, the proposed extension would be akin to that of a small commercial building which would be at odds with the domestic scale and character of the appeal dwelling. I find, therefore, that the proposal would significantly harm the character of the dwelling and would be contrary to CS policy 8d i) and ii) referred to earlier.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposal would be contrary to the development plan and there are no material considerations that would outweigh this. The appeal should be dismissed.

Sarah Colebourne

Inspector