



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 November 2025

by R Bartlett PGDip URP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/M2840/W/25/3369686

Peck House, Peck Way, Rushden, North Northamptonshire, NN10 6EX

- 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 Delaney Property Investments Ltd against the decision of North Northamptonshire Council.
 - The application Ref is NE/25/00019/FUL.
 - The development proposed is a rear dormer roof extension to create a single flat along with associated internal alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host building and the wider area.

Reasons

3. The three-storey appeal property is much higher than its two-storey neighbours, and is in an angled position, on a bend in the road, opposite a junction, and at the bottom of a hill. Due to the height and position of the building, its roof is visually prominent from multiple public viewpoints. The front and sides of the appeal property face onto Higham Road and are also visible in views along Hayway, and from the junction of Washbrook Road. The rear and sides are visible from Peck Way, North Street and the large retail car park on the opposite side of Peck Way.
4. Surrounding properties comprise a mixture of houses, commercial and community premises that are predominantly of traditional design. Eaves and ridge heights are varied but roofs are generally pitched, with a tiled finish and chimney stacks. I noted that there are roof lights in the front and rear of several properties as well as some small, pitched roof dormers and low-level front gables. The appeal property itself has two pitched roof dormers to the front, which run through the eaves level, are evenly spaced and are set in from the gable walls, respecting the symmetry of the building and the sloping roofscape. I saw only one large flat roof rear dormer, which does detract from the appearance of the area, but is less visually prominent than the appeal site. I have not been advised whether this dormer required or was granted planning permission.
5. The proposed flat roof, box style dormer roof extension would be only marginally set in from the gable ends of the building and only marginally set down from the roof ridge. Due to its excessive scale and design, covering almost the whole of the rear roof slope, it would appear bulky and top heavy. It would not blend into its

residential surroundings or be typical of the area, even with the use of matching materials. It would erode the traditional sloping roofscape, which is a positive and distinctive characteristic of the area.

6. I acknowledge that some views of the dormer would be obscured by existing buildings and trees. However, this does not reduce my concerns regarding the multiple clear views of the roof, including in views along the frontage of the building, where the sides of the large dormer would be highly visible and would alter the shape, form and appearance of the pitched roof, failing to respect the original traditional form of the building, or those immediately surrounding it.
7. I therefore conclude that the proposal would harmfully detract from the appearance of the host building and its surroundings, contrary to policy 8 of the North Northampton Joint Core Strategy 2011-2031, policy EN11 of the East Northamptonshire Local Plan Part 2 (2023), policy EN1 of the Rushden Neighbourhood Plan (2018), and paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework. These policies collectively seek to ensure that new development is of high-quality design that responds to the site's immediate and wider context and local character. This harm would not be outweighed by the modest benefit of creating an additional flat in this sustainable location.

Other Matters

8. I have been provided with confirmation that the relevant financial contribution has been made to mitigate the effect of the development on the Upper Nene Gravel Pits Special Protection Area. However, as I am dismissing the appeal there is no need for me to consider this matter further.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above I conclude that the proposal conflicts with the development plan taken as a whole and there are no considerations to indicate that a decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

R Bartlett

INSPECTOR