



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 September 2025

by **D J Barnes MBA BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/M2840/D/25/3370194

32 Wymington Road, Rushden, Northamptonshire NN10 9JX

- 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 Wayne Taylor against the decision of North Northamptonshire Council.
 - The application Ref is NE/24/00956/FUL.
 - The development proposed is the erection of rear extension (part three storey, part single storey) and a first floor extension above the existing kitchen and loft conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. It is considered that the main issues are the effects of the proposed development on (a) the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area; (b) the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties by reason of being overbearing and (c) the safety of other highway users.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The appeal property is an extended 2-storey dwelling situated within a primarily residential area where the dwellings vary in type, form and design. Along the western side of Wymington Road the dwellings are generally set back from the footways to the rear of front gardens that are landscaped and used for parking. Some of these dwellings have been extended to the rear and side, including the 2-storey side additions with flat roofs at 38, 40 and 42 Wymington Road. The property's existing 2-storey side addition also has a flat roof.
4. The rear elevation of the property and adjoining dwellings are visible from a pedestrian/cycle access to Hall Park. There is also a view of the existing side extension and the rear roofslope through the gap between the property and No. 30. There is a more restricted view through the narrower gap between the property and No. 34.
5. The proposed development includes the erection of side and rear extensions. The proposed side extension would be constructed above a single storey addition and would possess a flat roof similar to the current extension. At the rear, the existing

single storey addition would be replaced by a 3-storey extension. This extension would include the existing hipped roof being altered to a gable form to create a dormer style addition to the roof. Within this dormer's rear elevation would be a large, glazed opening that would accentuate the appearance of a 3-storey extension.

6. From the road and through the gaps, the increase in the size of the roof and its change of form would be noticeable. In addition, the first floor side extension with its flat roof would be seen from the road. However, these elements of the appeal scheme would not materially alter the property's contribution to the character and appearance of the streetscene, especially where there are no changes to the front elevation. Contrary to the council's claim, the resulting property would not be an incongruous feature in the streetscene.
7. However, although individual elements of the appeal scheme might be acceptable in isolation, when taken together and in conjunction with the existing addition, the scale and massing of the proposed development would not represent a subservient addition to the property. This judgement particularly applies to the 3-storey rear extension when viewed from neighbouring gardens and the access to Hall Park. This element of the appeal scheme, in particular the gable roof dormer and its extensive opening, would physically and visually dominate the property. The 3-storey rear extension would also fail to respect the original design and form of the property, including its hipped roof.
8. The appellant has identified that the proposed development would not significantly increase the footprint of the property, the alterations to the roof would not increase its height and, where appropriate, permitted development tolerances have been utilised. However, these matters are not judged to outweigh the unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host property which has been identified associated with, in particular, the 3-storey rear extension.
9. On this issue, it is concluded that the proposed development would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host property and, as such, it would conflict with Policy 8 of the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (CS), Policy EN11 of the East Northamptonshire Local Plan (LP) and Policy EN1 of the Rushden Neighbourhood Plan (NP). Amongst other matters, these policies require development to respond to a site's immediate and wider context, and for extensions not to detract from the character of the existing building.
10. CS Policy 1 is a strategic policy concerned with achieving sustainable development rather than being a development management policy.

Living Conditions

11. The proposed development would extend the 2-storey flank walls of the existing property rearwards adjacent to the shared boundaries with Nos. 30 and 34. These extended flank walls would be visible from the amenity areas immediately to the rear of these neighbouring properties. There would also be an outlook from some of the windows of Nos. 30 and 34 which would include the extended flank walls. The side window serving a habitable room of No. 30 would have an outlook towards a proposed 2-storey wall. However, this is a secondary opening with the main outlook being provided by a rear facing window.

12. From their amenity spaces, the occupiers of the neighbouring properties would have an increased sense of enclosure associated with the proposed development. However, because of the existing relationships between the property and Nos. 30 and 34, the size of the gardens and the limited degree of the rearward projection of the rear extension there would not be sufficient harm caused to the neighbouring occupiers by reason of the appeal scheme being an overbearing form of development to justify the appeal failing on these grounds.
13. For the reasons given, it is concluded that the proposed development would not cause unacceptable harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring properties by reason of being overbearing and, as such, there would not be a conflict with CS Policy 8 and NP Policy EN1 and the council's *Householder Extensions Supplementary Planning Document*. Amongst other matters, these policies require development to protect amenity by not resulting in an unacceptable impact on the amenities of neighbouring properties, including preserving existing neighbouring amenity by not appearing overbearing.

Highway Safety

14. In the absence of sufficient details, concerns were raised by the highway authority about whether an appropriate number of off-street car parking spaces could be provided as part of the proposed development. However, based upon the evidence provided by the appellant and observations made during the site visit, the width of the property's front garden is sufficient to enable 3 vehicles to be parked. There would also be space available for vehicles to manoeuvre within the remainder of the front garden.
15. If this appeal succeeds there would be the opportunity to impose a condition requiring parking details to be submitted for approval to the council. These details would also include the visibility splay for pedestrians and this would be assisted by the footway being separated from the property's front boundary wall by a grass strip.
16. On this issue, it is concluded that the proposed development would not cause an unacceptable danger to the safety of other highway users and, as such, it would not conflict with CS Policy 8 which refers to ensuring that developments provide satisfactory means of access and provision for parking in accordance with adopted standards.

Conclusion

17. Although the proposed development would not cause unacceptable harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties by reason of being overbearing and there would not be an unacceptable danger to the safety of other highway users, these matters are demonstrably and significantly outweighed by the unacceptable harm caused to the character and appearance of the host property. Accordingly, it is concluded that this appeal should be dismissed.

D J Barnes

INSPECTOR