



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 August 2025

by **Victor Callister BA(Hons) PGC(Oxon) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/M2840/D/25/3368913

2 Sandringham Close, Wellingborough, North Northamptonshire NN8 2EL

- 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 Declan Mackey against the decision of North Northamptonshire Council.
 - The application Ref is NW/25/00062/FUL.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side extension with dormer loft conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and that of the local area.

Reasons

3. The appeal dwelling is a two storey semi-detached buff brick house with hipped tile roof. The appeal dwelling and its semi-detached pair are set at a 45 degrees angle to the street, with the main entrance to the appeal dwelling positioned on what has the appearance of the side elevation of the semi-detached pair, which faces the street. An associated single detached garage is located to the side and rear of the appeal dwelling.
4. The character of the area is defined by detached and semi-detached 2 storey houses that share a simple generic house design common to newer residential areas of this type, but with a variety of hipped and gabled roof forms with similar proportions and angles. The local area is made up of cul-de-sacs that form the larger Sandringham Close area, which follows the local topography and rises up towards Duke Street, giving the roofscape of the area prominence in terms of the character and appearance of the local area.
5. The proposed two storey side extension would be in materials to match existing and would be positioned on that side of the appeal dwelling with the front door that angles away from the street. It would be set well back from the front elevation of the semi-detached pair to one side of the existing main entrance. It would be approximately 2.8 metres wide, approximately 5.2 metres long and would extend to align with the rear elevation of the semi-detached pair.

6. At roof level the proposed extension would have gabled ends to the front and rear, with a steep pitch that would result in it being approximately 0.4 metres taller than the existing house. The longer flank elevation of the proposal that would face the street would be windowless with a blank and featureless quality. There would, however, be windows in both the front and rear elevations that match the scale, proportions and design of existing windows. That side of the roof of the proposed extension facing the street would be taken up entirely by a box dormer with a single window.
7. The height and pitch of the gable ends of the proposal would not match that of the existing roof of the appeal dwelling or gable ends to other dwellings in the local area. In combination with the proportions of the proposed extension, this would result in the proposed extension being overly narrow and incongruous in relation to the proportions of the appeal dwelling and its semi-detached pair. This incongruity would be further accentuated by the proposed box dormer to the street facing side of the roof of the proposal. Due to its position, scale and box form, which would appear as a bulky dominating and overly prominent roof feature, discordant with the appeal dwelling and the streetscape and roofscape of the local area.
8. For the reasons given, the proposal would appear in stark contrast to the design of the appeal dwelling and as a dominant rather than secondary and subordinate addition. Given the prominent location of the appeal dwelling, the detrimental effect of the proposal on its character and appearance would be evident in views from the surrounding close and neighbouring dwellings. As such, the proposal would result in the appeal dwelling appearing as incongruous in relation to neighbouring dwellings and the wider streetscene and roofscape, thereby detracting from the character and appearance of the local area.
9. In response to the council's reasons for refusing the original application, the appellant has made suggested design changes to the appeal proposal in their appeal submission. However, no plans have been submitted by the appellant that illustrate these suggested changes. No opportunity has, therefore, been given to other parties to consider and comment on these suggested changes, or for me to determine whether these suggested changes constitute minor material amendment. I am therefore unable to consider these suggested changes as part of this appeal.
10. The Council's Residential Extensions: A guide to Good Design Supplementary Planning Guidance (2002) advises that extensions reflect and enhance the appearance of their host in size, proportions and the roof's height and angles. It also advises that dormers be set well into a roof slope and without a flat roof, and that on corner sites, particular attention should be given to how the side of the extension is treated. so as not to disfigure the face of the house. In size, proportion, flank wall and roof design and massing, the proposal fails to accord with this design advice.
11. Paragraph 139 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2024) sets out that development that is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies and government guidance on design, taking into account any local design guidance and supplementary planning documents such as design guides and codes. This is the case in this instance.

12. For the reasons given above, the proposal would result in substantial harm to the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling and that of the local area. This would conflict with Policy 8 of the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy 2011-2031 (2016). Amongst other matters, this seeks to ensure that development, including by extension, responds to the sites immediate and wider context, topography, form, character and setting.

Conclusion

13. The appeal is dismissed.

Victor Callister

INSPECTOR