
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 September 2025

by Graham Wraight BA(Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/M2840/D/25/3367307

78 Park Avenue, Rushden NN10 9NR

- 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 O Aiyegbusi against the decision of North Northamptonshire Council.
 - The application Ref is NE/24/01079/FUL.
 - The development proposed is a ground floor rear extension. Part first floor rear, front and side extension. Rear dormer roof extension, two front roof windows.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are (i) the effect of the proposed front extension on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area and (ii) whether an acceptable parking provision would be provided at the property.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. There is great variation in house designs and the designs of extensions to them within the immediate vicinity of the appeal site. However, even accounting for this, the appeal proposal would appear as an incongruous addition to the street scene because of the inclusion of a substantial section of flat roof. That part of the proposed roof would be very prominent in the street scene and would result in an awkward and visually harmful design solution, out of keeping with the design of the host dwelling and other nearby dwellings. This element of the proposal would as a result cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.
4. Whilst the Council also has further concerns about the scale and massing of the proposed front extension, it would not be set any further forward than the existing front gable of the dwelling. To my mind it is not the fact that there would be an extension to the front of the dwelling *per se* that results in the harm, but the fact that its roof would not visually integrate into the character or the design of its host dwelling at all.
5. Although the dwelling immediately adjacent at 76 Park Avenue has a flat roofed side extension, the impact of this is mitigated to some degree by a dummy pitched roof to its front. But in any event, where its roof can be seen, that extension is not visually sympathetic to the overall design of its host dwelling. That the appeal

dwelling is detached and benefits from a wide plot, that the proposal would not create a terracing effect, that the appeal dwelling is set back from No 76, that a section of cat-slide roof would be removed and that the Council does not have concerns with the other elements of the proposal are not matters which justify the harm that I have identified.

6. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposal would fail to accord with Policy 8(d)(i) and (ii) of the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy 2016 (CS) and Policy EN11 of the East Northamptonshire Local Plan Part 2 2023 where, taken together, they seek to promote good design and to protect character and appearance.

Parking

7. There have been various iterations of plans which purport to show the parking arrangements that could be achieved at the appeal property. However, the appeal dwelling has a substantially sized frontage with an in-out access arrangement. Whilst there would be the possibility of the middle vehicle being 'blocked in' it would be within the gift of the occupiers to arrange the parking of vehicles. I am satisfied on the basis of the information before me and my own observations at the site visit that three vehicles could be accommodated off the road. Furthermore, parking on the road is not restricted and Park Avenue is of a width that can accommodate such parking.
8. Therefore, the proposal would not result in an unacceptable impact on highway safety. Consequently, it would accord with Policy 8 (b)(i) and (ii) of the CS where it refers to highway considerations.

Other Matters

9. I acknowledge that the appellant has amended the proposal following concerns raised by the Council during the course of a previous planning application. No concerns are raised by the Council with respect to the impact upon the living conditions of the occupiers of nearby properties. These are not however considerations which overcome the harm that would result to character and appearance.

Conclusion

10. Whilst I have found that no harm would arise in highway safety terms, I have found that significant harm would result to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area, and a consequent failure to accord with the development plan. Therefore, the appeal should be dismissed.

Graham Wraight

INSPECTOR