



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 July 2025

by **J Somers BSocSci (Planning) MA (HEC) MRTPI IHBC**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/M2840/D/25/3366278

35 The Crescent, Easton On The Hill, PE9 3LZ

- 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 Elliot against the decision of North Northamptonshire Council.
 - The application reference is NE/24/01211/FUL.
 - The development proposed as described is a 'Two storey rear extension.'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. I note that the submitted proposed floor plans¹ do not completely align with the submitted proposed elevation plans², in that the floor plans show a window to the bathroom on the first floor which is not present on the elevation plans. This does not materially affect the application and I am still able to proceed with this appeal. I also note that the plans show a new first floor window proposed into the gable of the existing building to Bedroom 2 which has not been included within the description of development on the Application Form. The window is not proposed as being opaque so would also need to be assessed as part of this appeal. I shall make my decision on this basis.

Main issues

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed rear extension and new window upon:
 - The character and appearance of the host building, including the surrounding locality; and
 - The living conditions of existing and surrounding occupiers, with particular regard to sense of enclosure, access to light and outlook, and privacy.

¹ 'Proposed Plans Option 2,' Drawing Number 2402-05B, Dated Aug 24

² 'Proposed Elevations Option 2,' Drawing Number 2402-06C, Dated Aug 24

Reasons

Character and Appearance

4. The appeal property is an end terraced property that is part of The Crescent which is a planned housing development consisting of different periods during the mid-late twentieth century. Like developments occurring around this time, there is an emphasis on greenspaces with areas of grass verges to the front of properties that follow the road edge which adds to an open and green appearance together with hedges around boundaries and gaps in between dwellings that allow views to tops of trees in rear gardens.
5. The appeal site appears to have been the last dwelling erected on the curve prior to The Crescent being extended later with detached dwellings that are set back from the road edge but do not follow the setbacks of the earlier development. As such there is an unusual relationship between the appeal site which is set forward from the neighbouring dwelling No.38 where the appeal site is orientated along a south-west to north-west axis, whereas No.38 is orientated along a north-south axis. Due to this positioning the appeal site has a triangular shaped garden that is narrower at the rear boundary. The appeal dwelling along with the adjoining terrace is a simple and functional design with pitched roof fronting the street, concrete tiles and buff brick with uPVC window frames. The development along the Crescent from No.38 to the east consists of a development of detached dwellings constructed of brick with feature hanging tiles and render to the front facades.
6. In undertaking extensions, North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (JCS) Policy 8 sets a number of place making principles, where applications are expected to create a distinctive local character by responding to the context and local character, form and landscape setting of the settlement, amongst others. Additionally, the East Northamptonshire Local Plan (ENLP) Policy EN11 is directly related to extensions and seeks that they integrate positively with the surrounding area, does not detract from the character of existing buildings and contains careful detailing which reflects local distinctiveness, amongst others. The Decision Notice also notes JCS Policy 1 which relates to the presumption in favour of sustainable development.
7. The proposed rear extension is two storeys and has an angled rear façade that is 4.925 metres deep along the south-east façade and 3.215 metres deep at the north west façade. This creates an awkward and asymmetrical appearance to the host dwelling that overcomplicates the simple and functional design. The extension is quite deep when compared to the footprint of the host dwelling with the ridge of the extension at the same height as the host dwelling, which does not give a subservient appearance. Other elements such as a Juliet balcony at first floor level is not a dominant characteristic within this area.
8. I can appreciate the design methodology and the reasoning for designing the extension as per the Appellant's Statement of Case, however the architectural approach is overly complicated and has an awkward appearance when appreciated amongst the existing dwellings. I can appreciate that there are limited views to the extension from a public vantage point, however an assessment of character and appearance as per ENLP Policy EN11 or JCS Policy 8 is not limited to what can only be experienced within a public realm or vantage point. As the dwelling is part of a terrace and a development to the top of the crescent which is of the same material and design palette of brick, the use of render is also problematic. It would appear

that examples of the later development of detached houses have been utilised to justify this decision, however these dwellings have a different status and design approach when compared to the appeal site which is part of an earlier development.

9. A similar assessment is also had with regards to the Applicant's SoC which comments that neighbouring dwellings such as No.38 have had relatively large rear extensions which in their opinion would set a precedent for the types of development acceptable at the appeal property. The dwellings of No.38 and the development to the east are detached and have different design approaches to that of the appeal site which is part of the terrace and development of dwellings to the west. No.38 is also setback further into the site than the appeal site, the two sites are not comparable in this regard as they require different design approaches.
10. In conclusion of this matter, the proposed two storey extension is of an awkward appearance that as a result of its massing, proportions, and asymmetrical appearance does not integrate with the characteristics of the existing dwelling or the greater locality. As such the proposed scheme would be contrary to ENLP Policy EN11 and JCS Policies 1 and 8 as described previously.

Living Conditions

11. Beginning with access to light, due to the positioning of the sun, during the morning the proposed rear extension would cause some shadow over the neighbouring property No.33 The Crescent. However, by the afternoon this dwelling would receive an adequate level of sun to the rear garden, which would not be obstructed by the proposed extension. Due to the setback of No.38 when compared to the appeal site, the rear garden would be relatively unaffected by any shadow cast from the proposed extension.
12. Due to the angle of the facades between the appeal site and No.38, the insertion of the new window to bedroom 2 would not appear to gain direct views into the habitable room window of the first floor of No.38 or vice-versa. However it is noted that the proposed rear extension would alleviate some of the overlooking that appears to occur from the 1st floor window of the gable of this neighbouring dwelling into the rear 1st floor windows of the appeal property. The projection of the proposed extension towards the side boundary of No.38 would lessen the proximity between the first floor gable window of the neighbouring property and the rear, however the angled nature of the rear extension does appear to offset some of the overlooking that would occur. Due to the unusual placement of No.s 38 and the appeal site there is already a degree of overlooking from the appeal site to the rear garden, where No.38 has a screen around part of the private open space. The increased depth of the rear extension should not increase the perception of overlooking, however the Juliet balcony is more problematic particularly as it encourages occupants to stand at the window and look out to the rear which does increase the perception of overlooking to residents at No.s 33 and No.38.
13. Turning to sense of enclosure, the neighbouring dwelling at No.33 is part of the terrace, and has a rear extension with lean-to roof. The two storey element of the proposed extension at its shortest depth would be to the end of the ground floor rear extension and would be setback from the boundary with this neighbouring property. To me, it would appear to be a sufficient setback of the first floor, with there being an appropriate outlook and access to light from the first floor of this neighbouring dwelling. Whilst there might be a slight change in perception of the extension from

the neighbouring property, it would not be to a level that would cause adverse detriment to the living conditions of the neighbouring occupier at No.33.

14. Looking at the relationship of No.38 which is setback further into the site, this dwelling is sufficiently setback from the appeal building to avoid any adverse detriment as a result of loss of light and a sense of enclosure.
15. Taking the above into account and in conclusion of this matter, I have not found that there is adverse detriment caused by the proposed extension with regards to sense of enclosure and loss of light. However, the Juliet balcony to the 1st floor rear of the extension would increase the perception of overlooking to the detriment of living conditions to neighbouring residents at Nos 33 and 38 The Crescent. As such, the proposal would be contrary to JCS Policy 1 & 8 which seeks that development not cause adverse detriment to the living conditions of current and future occupiers by elements such as privacy.

Other Matters

16. I acknowledge comments in the Appellant's SoC around the benefits of the development which can improve living space for the existing applicants, which is more of a private benefit. There are also benefits in changing the diversity of dwelling sizes which will increase thermal performance and the increased short term employment opportunities in constructing the extension. However, these benefits would also be present in a proposal that is more in compliance with the development plan. I also note that the Appellant notes that there were no objections to the scheme from consultees or surrounding residents. Whilst this might be the case, these are not considered to be material considerations that would override the considerations against the policies of the Development Plan. There are consequently no material considerations that warrant a decision other than in accordance with the development plan.

Conclusion

17. For the reasons given above, the appeal is dismissed.

J Somers

INSPECTOR