
Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 14 October 2025

by **L Wilson BA (Hons) MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 October 2025

Appeal A Ref: APP/W2845/D/25/3368807

543 Kettering Road North, Northampton NN3 6HA

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant approval required under Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A, Paragraph A.4 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) (GPDO).
 - The appeal is made by Ahmed Riyad against the decision of West Northamptonshire Council.
 - The application Ref is 2025/1416/PNHPD.
 - The development proposed is single storey rear extension: 6m deep, 3.2m maximum height, 3m high to the eaves.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/W2845/D/25/3368812

543 Kettering Road North, Northampton NN3 6HA

- 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 Ahmed Riyad against the decision of West Northamptonshire Council.
 - The application Ref is 2025/1553/FULL.
 - The development proposed was originally described as householder planning application for the construction of a two-storey side extension at 543 Kettering Road North.
-

Decision

Appeal A

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal B

2. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

3. As set out above there are two appeals at this site. I have considered each on its individual merits, but I have combined both appeals into a single decision to avoid duplication.

Main Issues

4. In respect of Appeal A, the main issue is whether the proposed development would be granted planning permission by Article 3(1), Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A of the GPDO and the impact of the proposed development on the amenity of adjoining premises, with particular reference to outlook.
5. In respect of Appeal B, the main issues are:

- The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area;
- Whether the proposed development would provide adequate parking provision; and
- The effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of the occupiers of 541 Kettering Road North (no. 541), with particular reference to outlook.

Reasons

Appeal A

6. Under Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A of the GPDO, planning permission is granted for the enlargement of a dwellinghouse subject to limitations and conditions.
7. Where an application is made for a determination as to whether prior approval is required for development which exceeds the limits in paragraph A.1(f) but is allowed by paragraph A.1(g) to Part 1, paragraph A.4(3) provides that the local planning authority may refuse the application where it considers that the proposed development does not comply with – or that the developer has provided insufficient information to enable the authority to establish whether the proposed development complies with the conditions, limitations or restrictions that are applicable to such permitted development.
8. Where any owner or occupier of any adjoining premises objects to the proposed development, paragraph A.4(7) to Part 1 requires the local planning authority to assess the impact of the proposed development on the amenity of adjoining premises, taking into account any representations received.

Amenity

9. 543 Kettering Road North is a two-storey, semi-detached dwelling situated in a predominantly residential area. The rear elevation of the adjoining dwelling, 545 Kettering Road North (no. 545), contains windows and glazed doors which would be near the proposed extension. Whilst no. 545 has a single storey garage building to the opposite side boundary, it does not have a rear extension.
10. The single-storey extension would be adjacent to the common boundary and would result in a significant rear projection due to the depth of the extension. The proposal would have a detrimental impact on particularly the ground floor glazed doors as it would unacceptably dominate the outlook from this room. Thus, the proposed development would have an overbearing impact upon no. 545 because of the extension's depth, height and siting adjacent to the common boundary. Views from no. 545's garden would also be dominated by the large extension.
11. The appellant highlights that the proposal falls within the limitations of Class A of the GPDO, it would be acceptable in terms of sunlight and overshadowing, would not be out of character, and the internal layout is not relevant in this case. However, such matters do not outweigh the harm I have found.
12. For the reasons given above, the proposed development would harm the amenity of the adjoining occupiers of no. 545. Consequently, prior approval should not be granted.

13. The provisions of the development plan, so far as they are relevant, have been considered. Having regard to the parameters set out within the GPDO, the scheme would conflict with the aims of Policy Q2 of the Northampton Local Plan: Part 2 2011 – 2029 (2023) (LP). This seeks to ensure development creates and protects a high standard of amenity for occupiers. The proposal would also not align with the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), insofar as it seeks to ensure developments create places with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users at paragraph 135. Nor would it align with the Council's Residential Extensions and Alterations Design Guide (2011) (SPD) which seeks to ensure that proposed works do not adversely affect the amenity of occupiers of adjoining and surrounding properties, particularly through loss of outlook.

Appeal B

Character and appearance

14. This section of Kettering Road North is primarily characterised by two-storey, semi-detached dwellings. The dwellings are set back from the highway behind either a small front garden area or driveway. The majority of dwellings have driveways to the side running to a garage which results in a regular streetscene. Some dwellings have garages adjacent to the side of the dwelling, but as these are single-storey the sense of space between dwellings is maintained.
15. The proposal would erode the gap to the side boundary, which is an important characteristic of the area, and would not be set back from the main front wall of the dwelling. The two-storey extension would therefore fail to maintain the character and appearance of the area because it would not respect the pattern of development and regular streetscene, rather than constituting overdevelopment.
16. The proposal would not create a terracing effect as no. 541 has not been extended to the side (albeit the driveway does lead to a garage) and the proposed gap to the side boundary would be adequate. It would therefore not conflict with paragraph 7.5 of the SPD which seeks to ensure an adequate gap between the boundary and sidewall of the extension to avoid a terracing effect.
17. There are examples of two-storey side extensions nearby, for example at 529 Kettering Road North (no. 529). I saw that these are very much in the minority, and I do not know the circumstances of those cases or the policies that applied at the time of their consideration. The design of the proposal would be more in keeping with the architectural style of the street than no. 529's extension. Nonetheless, two-storey side extensions are not a common feature along this part of Kettering Road North, and those that I saw served to confirm that such extensions can be to the detriment of the character and appearance of the area.
18. Similarly, the proposed extension cannot be directly compared to the garages and outbuildings built adjacent to the boundary seen in the local area. This is because the extension would be a two-storey addition which would be more prominent and would have a greater impact on eroding the space between the properties. The single storey garages and outbuildings maintain the sense of space between dwellings.
19. For the reasons given above, the proposed development would have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area. Consequently, it would conflict with Policy Q1 of the LP which seeks to promote

high quality design and ensure development responds to and enhances locally distinct townscape characteristics.

20. In relation to this main issue, the proposal would not conflict with Policy Q2 of the LP which the reason for refusal refers to. This is because this policy seeks to ensure that development creates and protects a high standard of amenity for occupiers.

Parking

21. The proposed development would remove the existing parking to the side of the dwelling. Local residents have highlighted that, given the nearby school, the road is used at drop-off and pick-up times of the day. This section of Kettering Road North is narrow, and I observed on my site visit that vehicles that were parked on the road were partially parked on the footway. Parking on the footway can cause issues for those with a mobility impairment and anyone pushing a pushchair.
22. The drawings show that the dwelling currently has three bedrooms, and the proposed development would result in 5 bedrooms along with a study. Given the proposed drawing shows 2 parking spaces, the proposal would conflict with chapter 9 of the Northamptonshire Parking Standards (2016) (NPS) which sets out that 3 vehicle spaces should be provided for a 4+ bedroom dwelling.
23. The evidence before me indicates that the width of the parking spaces would be in line with the measurements set out in chapter 3 of the NPS, but the length would be marginally below the recommended dimensions.
24. I observed on my site visit that there are parking layouts similar to that proposed. However, in those cases part or all of the boundary wall had been removed to allow for easier access. There is no clear information before me which suggests that the boundary wall is proposed to be altered in this case. Hence, it is likely that one vehicle would need to be moved onto the road for the other to access the space and vehicles would therefore be parked in effectively a tandem sequence. Thus, the proposal would be at odds with paragraph 3.10 of the Council's Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document (2019) (SPD) which sets out that tandem parking should be avoided. As set out in paragraph 3.10 of the SPD, in practice, this tends to result in vehicles being parked on the carriageway and can be highly inconvenient for residents. However, I am mindful that the existing parking arrangement comprises tandem parking. Consequently, in isolation, the proposed parking layout does not weigh against the proposal.
25. In conclusion, when drawing the above points together, and considering the increased number of bedrooms proposed along with the Council's parking standards and characteristics of the road, the appellant has failed to adequately demonstrate that the proposed development would provide adequate parking provision. Thus, the proposal is likely to increase on-street parking and could negatively impact highway safety and convenience. Consequently, it would conflict with Policy MO4 of the LP which states that new development must meet adopted parking standards and have regard to the principles set out in the Parking Standards SPD.

Living conditions

26. The proposed extension would increase the level of built development in proximity to no. 541. The side elevation of no. 541 contains two small windows along with a partially glazed side door. There is no clear evidence before me to suggest that these serve principal rooms. Given the nature of the windows, it is unlikely that they are main windows or serve rooms where occupants would spend significant amounts of time. Consequently, based on the information presented, and distance between the extension and no. 541's windows, I am satisfied that the development would not have an overbearing impact on no. 541 or be overly dominant.
27. The appellant sets out that the Council are concerned that the extension would result in overshadowing. The reasons for refusal and delegated report do not refer to overshadowing. In any event, I am satisfied that the proposal would not cause unacceptable overshadowing considering the distance to neighbouring windows and their use.
28. For these reasons, the proposed development would have an acceptable effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of no. 541, with particular reference to outlook. Accordingly, in this regard, it would comply with Policy Q2 of the LP which states that development will be required to create and protect a high standard of amenity for occupiers.

Other Matters

29. The appellant highlights that the appeal proposals represent sustainable development that responds to the needs of a growing multigenerational household. However, such considerations do not outweigh the harm and conflict found above.

Conclusion

30. For the reasons given above, having considered the development plan as a whole, the GPDO, the approach in the Framework, and all other material considerations, I conclude that the appeals do not succeed.

L Wilson

INSPECTOR