
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 March 2025 by T Morris BA (Hons) MSc

Decision by A M Nilsson BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9th June 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W2845/D/25/3359039

14 Primrose Walk, Grange Park, West Northamptonshire NN4 5DE

- 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 Ghazanfar Ejaz against the decision of West Northamptonshire Council.
 - The application Ref is 2024/2563/FULL.
 - The development proposed is a double storey side extension with room in loft/granny's annex.
-

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.

Preliminary Matter

3. The Council's third reason for refusal concerns the standard of the submitted information. However, whilst there are some minor discrepancies between the proposed block plan, floor plans and elevations, there is sufficient certainty to determine the appeal in relation to the main issues, which are as follows.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are:
 - i) The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area; and
 - ii) The principle of the proposed development, with specific regard to its size and intended use.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Character and appearance

5. The appeal site comprises a two-storey detached dwelling and detached garage, which is situated within a prominent position in a modern housing estate. The estate is mostly characterised by detached and semi-detached two-storey dwellings in modest plots with small gaps to either side. Despite some variances to their individual design, the dwellings have consistencies in their scale, form and materials. At the roof level, they predominantly feature plain dual-pitched roof forms

with a mix of gables, hips and half-hips. Although the host dwelling is also situated within a modest plot, it is larger than most of the dwellings nearby and it has greater space to either side, factors which contribute positively towards a spacious character within the estate. Furthermore, with its particular design including parapet style gable ends and its dormer windows, together with its key location next to a playground and footpath, the host dwelling is notable within the estate and makes a positive contribution to the high-quality residential environment.

6. Due to the considerable scale of the proposed double storey side extension, together with its exposed location next to a playground and footpath, the extension would appear as a bulky and awkward addition to the host dwelling. Even accounting for the site's large corner plot, the setback of the extension and its existing dormer windows, the proposal would erode the sense of space around the dwelling, and the mass of the resulting dwelling would dominate its immediate surroundings. Moreover, its unsympathetic roof design and angled form would significantly jar with the remainder of the host dwelling, and it would contrast with the prevailing roof and property forms in the area.
7. Even though the front of the dwelling faces a footpath, given its location to the side, the extension would appear highly conspicuous from the public space of the playground and public footpath adjacent to the site. Due to its overall scale and angled design, the proposed extension would therefore be an incongruous addition to the host dwelling.
8. In summary, the proposed development would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. It would conflict with Policies SS2 and SDP1 of the South Northamptonshire Part 2 Local Plan (2020) (LP), which require that developments incorporate good design quality, which maintains or enhances the character and appearance of the building and integrates with its surroundings.
9. The proposal would also conflict with the guidance contained within Chapter 4 of the South Northamptonshire Design Guide (2017), which advises that ancillary accommodation should be clearly subservient to the main house in terms of scale and height and should be sympathetic to the character of the main house and wider area.

Principle of the proposal and its size and use

10. The annex section of the proposed double storey side extension is not specifically identified on the submitted floorplans. However, the floorplans indicate that there would be a link between the extension to the sitting room and family room of the existing dwelling at the ground floor. The floorplans further show that the first floor and second floor of the extension would have no internal link to the existing dwelling on these particular floors. It is this section of the proposed extension that the Council indicate would be used as an annex within their officer report and the submitted floorplans appear to be consistent with this.
11. Given the scale of the proposed extension, the annex would be relatively large. The proposed south elevation drawing also indicates that a separate entrance would be provided at the ground floor. Whilst it may be possible that it could be used as a separate dwelling, that is not the proposal before me, and no subdivision of the planning unit is proposed. The Council considered the scheme as a householder application and determined the application on that basis. The Appellant's evidence

also indicates that the annex would be occupied by a relative and there is nothing before me to contradict this. Furthermore, the occupation of the annex could be controlled by planning condition to prevent its use as a separate dwelling.

12. On this matter, the proposal would comply with Part F of Policy SS2 of the LP, which requires that development proposals provide a good standard of living for future occupiers and would not unacceptably harm the amenity of occupiers and users of neighbouring properties and the area.

Other Matters

13. I acknowledge that the proposed annex would provide accommodation for a relative and that this would give them a greater sense of independence. Furthermore, I accept that the Council did not find any harm in relation to the living conditions of occupiers of neighbouring properties, as well as in relation to parking matters. However, these matters do not justify the harm of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.
14. The appellant has referred to their frustration in relation to timescales and considers a more proactive approach could have been adopted by the Council. Nevertheless, these are not land use planning matters that would lead me to conclude favourably on the appeal.

Conclusion and Recommendation

15. Although I have found that the principle of the annex would not be unacceptable, this would not overcome the identified harm in terms of character and appearance.
16. The proposed development would therefore conflict with the development plan when taken as a whole and there are no other material planning considerations which would alter this finding. I therefore recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

T Morris

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

A M Nilsson

INSPECTOR