



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/25/3368526

32 Raunds Road, Stanwick, North Northamptonshire NN9 6PP

- 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 Matt Willis against the decision of North Northamptonshire Council.
 - The application Ref is NE/25/00198/FUL.
 - The development proposed is the replacement of the existing house roof and the addition of second floor dormers. Internal alterations to ground and first floor.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the replacement of the existing house roof and the addition of second floor dormers. Internal alterations to ground and first floor at 32 Raunds Road, Stanwick, North Northamptonshire NN9 6PP in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref NE/25/00198/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 development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 23-068-10C, 23-068-11C, 23-068-12C and, 23-068-13.
 - 3) 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.
 - 4) During the site set up, materials delivery and construction period of the development hereby permitted a 1.8 metre tall free standing fence shall be installed on the appeal site no closer than 0.5 metres to the trunk of the trees marked T1 and T2 on the approved plans.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal dwelling is a detached 2 storey house, with a pitched roof and gable flanks. There is an attached garage that projects forward from the main elevation of the house that sits to the side front garden, which is mainly given over to hard surfacing for parking vehicles. There is a large Austrian pine tree to the front and to

one side of the front garden of the appeal dwelling that is the subject of a Tree Preservation Order (TPO), with another similar tree with a TPO that appears to sit on the boundary between the appeal property and the end property in the neighbouring terrace. To the rear is a generous rear garden.

4. The appeal dwelling forms part of group of detached dwellings of similar scale, but with differing architectural expressions that sit between 2 rows of terraced houses, one significantly older than the other. A large detached bungalow sits to the rear of the neighbouring detached house. On the other side of the street is an extensive area of allotments. Overall, the local area has a varied set of properties of differing designs and ages, and as a result there is little visual cohesion between the groups of differing properties and there is even less cohesion within the group of detached properties of which the appeal dwelling forms part. This lends the local area a disparate quality to its character and appearance.
5. The proposal would raise the height of the appeal dwelling by approximately 1.12 metres, resulting in a steeper pitch to the roof than existing. To the front of the raised roof there would be two traditionally formed dormer windows and to the rear a dormer extension set into the rear roof slope
6. The proposal follows a recently dismissed appeal¹ for proposed extensions that included a similar proposal for a roof extension and conversion but also included proposals to extend the roof of the garage with the inclusion of a dormer window in the garage roof. It was the garage element of the proposal that the inspector for the refused appeal found to be harmful to the character and appearance of the local area. The appeal proposal in this instance does not include any extension to the garage.
7. The appeal proposal for the roof extension varies from that of the refused appeal by being approximately 0.35 metres taller than previously proposed and with two identical dormer windows to the rear roof slope and two dormer windows of varying size to the front roof slope. The Inspector raised no concerns with regard to the increase in height of the refused appeal proposal. Given the scale of the appeal dwelling and the variety of heights of roofs of neighbouring properties, I find the additional height now proposed to be marginal.
8. There were also no concerns expressed by the inspector for the refused appeal to the two proposed front dormer windows. As the revised appeal proposal has two identical traditionally formed dormer windows in the front roof slope, I find that these are an improvement on the previous proposal, as they reflect the scale of the appeal dwelling and align with the existing fenestration, providing a symmetrical appearance to the appeal dwelling when seen from the street and result in no detriment to its character or appearance. Although there are no front dormer windows to other properties in this part of the street, the existing variation in architectural expression between properties would allow the proposed dormers to sit harmoniously in the local streetscape in immediate frontal views and in more tangential views from further along the street.
9. The proposal is for a single centrally positioned rear dormer extension that would be set down from the roof ridge, up from the eaves and set in from the edges of the rear roof slope, with three windows that would align with the existing fenestration. The inspector for the refused appeal did not express any concerns with regard to

¹ Appeal Ref: APP/M2840/D/24/3355548

the two dormer windows previously proposed, and I similarly find that the rear dormer would not be prominent in views from the public realm and would only be evident in rear views of the appeal dwelling from the rear parts of surrounding neighbouring properties and the neighbouring detached bungalow. In these views, the proposed dormer would appear as sitting recessively in the rear roof slope, and to be a secondary and subordinate addition to the appeal dwelling in terms of volume and scale.

10. Overall, and for the reasons given, I do not find that the scale massing and design of the proposal would appear incongruous, or to result in a dominating impact on the appeal dwelling. It would therefore accord with the design advice for extensions and dormer windows set out in the East North Northamptonshire Household Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (2020). Consequently, I also find that the proposal would not result in any detrimental impact on the streetscene of the local area and its character and appearance.
11. Given the height and scale of the two TPO trees and distance to the nearest part of the proposal, I concur with the Council in finding that the proposal would result in no harm to these protected trees.
12. For the reasons given above, the proposal would not result in any significant harm to the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling or that of the local area and would not conflict with Policy 8 of the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy 2011-2031 (2016) and Policy EN11 of the East Northamptonshire Local Plan (2023). Amongst other matters, these collectively seek development, including by way of extension, that does not detract from the character of the existing building, integrates positively with the surrounding area and responds to the sites immediate and wider context, form, character and setting.

Conditions

13. Along with the standard condition relating to the timing of implementation, in the interests of design quality I have attached conditions requiring adherence to approved drawings and matching materials.
14. I have had regard to the pre-commencement condition requiring submission and approval of details of extensive tree protection measures, particularly for the 2 TPO trees close to the appeal dwelling. Given the small scale and roof location of the proposed development, the extent of the root area of the trees that sits predominantly under hard paving used for parking and the highway, I do not find that such protection measures are necessary in this instance and would not meet the test for conditions set out in Paragraph 57 of the Planning Policy Framework. I have therefore attached a more limited condition to the installation of protective fencing to the area adjacent to the trunks of the trees to protect them during the site set up, delivery of materials and construction period.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons given, the appeal is allowed.

Victor Callister

INSPECTOR