



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 August 2025

by Elaine Benson BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/M2840/D/25/3369083

4 Tithe Close, Ringstead, North Northamptonshire NN14 4TY

- 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 and Mrs T Mepstead against the decision of North Northamptonshire Council.
 - The application Ref is NE/25/00021/FUL.
 - The development proposed is described as 'first-floor side extension above attached garage and utility room. Proposed lean-to roof above garage frontage and entrance porch. Proposed internal alterations'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for first-floor side extension above attached garage and utility room. Proposed lean-to roof above garage frontage and entrance porch at 4 Tithe Close, Ringstead, North Northamptonshire NN14 4TY, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref NE/25/00021/FUL, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 224-019-01A - Survey drawing, 224-019-02 - Survey drawing, 224-019-03A - Planning drawing, 224-019-04A - Planning drawing, 224-019-1-1250 - Site location plan and 224-019-1-500 - Block plan.

Main Issues

2. The main issues in this appeal are the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area, its effect on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers and its effect on highway safety.

Reasons

3. The proposed first floor extension would be constructed above the existing side garage and would be set back from the front elevation of the frontage of the appeal property (No 4) in accordance with the Council's 'House Extensions' Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). The design of the extension, including

the roof, would respect that of No 4 and its overall scale would be proportionate. There would be no harm to the character and appearance of No 4.

4. The extension would extend to the side boundary and would close the currently wide visual gap at first floor level between No 4 and its neighbour at No 6. The resulting space between houses at this level would be less than is found elsewhere in the short cul-de-sac. However, having regard to the orientation of the properties and the variety of house designs within it, including design alterations resulting from extensions, the extension would not create a terracing effect and would not appear out of character or otherwise harmful to the street scene or the character of the wider area.
5. I conclude therefore that there would be no conflict with Policy EN11 of the East Northamptonshire Local Plan (LP), Policy R2 of the Ringstead Neighbourhood Plan (NP) or Policies 1 and 8 of the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) which, in summary and of relevance to this appeal, require high quality design which respects local character. There would be no conflict with the similar design aims of the SPD and those of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework).
6. In respect of the second main issue, the adjacent house, No 6, has a glazed kitchen door in the side elevation. This glazing is obscured which limits the amount of light passing through it. The door faces onto the side of the garage and could not reasonably be considered to have an outlook. The door is not the main source of light to the kitchen which also has a large window on the front elevation. Within this context, the additional storey would not have an unacceptable effect on light levels reaching this kitchen. There is an obscurely glazed bathroom window at first floor level which is openable and would face onto the proposed extension at a distance of around 1m. The bathroom and adjacent landing are not habitable rooms and as such there would be no loss of amenity to the neighbouring occupiers resulting from the closeness of the proposed extension. The passageway between the two houses is already narrow and its width would not be affected by the proposal. The extension would be no deeper than the existing house and would therefore not project any further into the back garden.
7. Having regard to the impact that the neighbouring garage and dwelling already have, as required by the SPD, I am satisfied that the side windows would still receive sufficient light. There would be no additional overshadowing resulting from the extension or any other loss of light that would be sufficient to justify withholding planning permission. There is no evidence to demonstrate that the neighbours' extraction and brick flues on their side elevation would be affected by the proposal, but in any event, this is not a planning consideration before me. Overall, whilst there would be a change in outlook for the adjoining occupiers, I am not convinced that this proposal would unacceptably harm their living conditions in respect of having an overbearing impact.
8. I conclude that there would be no harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of No 6. The proposal therefore complies with the SPD, Policies 1 and 8 of the JCS, Policy R2 of the NP and the Framework, which, in respect of this main issue, can be summarised as requiring new development to protect the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties.
9. Turning finally to highway safety issues; alterations to the frontage had been undertaken at the time of my site visit, in accordance with the requirements of the

Highway Authority set out in its consultation response. There is therefore no justification for objecting to the appeal proposal on this basis. Accordingly, there would be no conflicts with JCS Policy 8, the North Northamptonshire Parking Standard documents, Policy R8 of the NP in respect of its parking requirements or with the Framework.

10. I have had regard to all other matters raised, including comments from neighbouring occupiers and Ringstead Parish Council which do not affect my conclusions on the relevant planning matters. Accordingly, the appeal should be allowed, subject to the conditions that follow.

Conditions

11. A condition requiring the use of matching material is necessary to safeguard the appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. I have identified the approved drawings in a condition, for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

Elaine Benson

INSPECTOR