



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 August 2025

by **Ian McHugh DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/M2840.D/25/3366200

28 Wallis Road, Kettering, NN15 6NX

- 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 Vasile Tibuleac against the decision of North Northamptonshire Council.
 - The application Ref is NK/2025/0001.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension, loft conversion and internal alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Note

2. The description of the proposal used in the heading above is taken from the planning application form, which is the normal convention. I note that the description given in the Council's decision notice differs. However, as the description in the application form is accurate, I have assessed the proposal on that basis.

Main Issues

3. These are the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the streetscene; and the effect on the living conditions of the occupants of neighbouring dwellings.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

4. The appeal property is relatively small, single storey bungalow, which is situated in a residential area. The predominant character of the area is defined by two-storey terraced and semi-detached dwellings that vary in terms of their age and appearance. The appeal property appears distinctly different and is at odds with its surroundings.
5. The proposal is to increase the height of the existing dwelling to accommodate accommodation within the roof area at the front and rear of the property. Dormers would be constructed at the front and rear. A single storey extension, which would be built across the full width of the dwelling would also be constructed at the rear. It would project 4.3m from the existing rear wall of the property.
6. The Council considers that the proposed increase in the roof height of the dwelling, plus the front-facing dormer would be discordant and out of proportion with the

existing property. It points to the resultant large expanse of roof, which it considers would be overly dominant and unbalance the building's appearance.

7. The Council cites a conflict with Policy 8 of the adopted North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy 2011-2031 (JCS), which generally seeks (amongst other things) to ensure that the design of new development is of high quality. This accords with paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2024 (NPPF), which also requires developments to be visually attractive and to add to the overall quality of the area.
8. I acknowledge that the increased roof height and front-facing dormer would significantly change the appearance of both the property and the streetscene. However, it currently appears at odds with the prevailing built form along Wallis Road and the proposal, whilst it would still be lower, would result in a height and mass that would be closer to the scale of buildings in the locality. Furthermore, the proposed dormer at the front, would only occupy part of the roof area and it would appear as a subordinate feature due to its limited width and its position below the proposed ridge height of the dwelling.
9. The Council has not objected to the impact of the proposed rear extension and dormer, in terms of their effect on character and appearance and I have no reason to disagree with that view. I shall deal with their effect on living conditions below.
10. For the above reasons, I am not persuaded that the proposal would have an unacceptable impact on the character and appearance of either the existing dwelling or the streetscene. Accordingly, on this issue, the proposal would not conflict with Policy 8 of the JCS, or with the provisions of the NPPF, as referred to above.

Living Conditions

11. Policy 8(e)i of the JCS seeks to ensure that developments do not have an adverse impact on the amenities of neighbouring properties by reason of (amongst other things) loss of light or overlooking. Paragraph 135 of the NPPF also states that planning decisions should create places with a high standard of amenity.
12. The Council considers that the proposed rear extensions would have an adverse impact on number 26 and 30 Wallis Road (numbers 26 and 30), on either side of the appeal dwelling and on number 17 Akela Close (number 17) at the rear. These unacceptable impacts are considered by the Council to be a loss of privacy to number 17 and overbearing on numbers 26 and 30.
13. Regarding the single storey rear extension, I consider that the impact on the occupants of neighbouring dwellings would be acceptable. Whilst the appeal site sits at a higher level than number 17, the proposed relationship between the extension and the dwelling at number 17 would not be unusual in close knit urban areas and any overlooking would be partly obscured by boundary fencing. Furthermore, its flat roof would ensure that its height would not be unacceptably overbearing on numbers 26 and 30.
14. However, I consider that the impact of the rear facing dormer would be unacceptable. The existing rear of the appeal dwelling sits beyond the main rear walls of numbers 26 and 30 and the proposed dormer would create a structure that

would be overbearing on the outlook from both dwellings and their gardens on either side, because of its height, bulk and close proximity to the side boundaries.

15. In addition, the dormer would include a main bedroom window (in addition to a bathroom) that would face directly towards number 17. Whilst properties on Akela Close already experience a degree of overlooking from the rear windows of the houses on Wallis Road, the proposal would appear closer and the perception and the extent of overlooking would be exacerbated by the difference in levels between the dwellings.
16. The appellant points to the fact that rear facing dormers can be constructed as permitted development. However, that would not be the case at the appeal property, as any proposal would require an increase in the existing roof height. Consequently, this argument carries little weight in my assessment of the appeal proposal.
17. Therefore, for the above reasons, I conclude that the proposal would have an unacceptably harmful effect on the living conditions of the occupants of neighbouring dwellings. Accordingly, it would conflict with Policy 8 (e)i of the JCS and with the provisions of paragraph 135 of the NPPF.

Conclusion

18. It is concluded that the appeal be dismissed.

Ian McHugh

INSPECTOR