



---

## 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: 10 November 2025

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/M2840/D/25/3371997**

**2 Crabb Street, Rushden, North Northamptonshire, NN10 0RH**

- 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 Makles Lloshi against the decision of North Northamptonshire Council.
  - The application Ref is NE/25/00464/FUL.
  - The development proposed is a loft conversion into a room.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Preliminary Matters

2. The loft conversion includes the construction of a large dormer roof extension to the rear of the dwelling, which has already been completed. As such planning permission is sought retrospectively.

### Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and its surroundings, including its effect on the Rushden Conservation Area (RCA) and the setting of the nearby Grade II listed building at 5A-7 Crabb Street.

### Reasons

4. Section 66(1) of The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires that in considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, special regard shall be had to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting. Section 72 requires that special attention is paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of conservation areas.
5. I have not been provided with a Conservation Area Appraisal, but it was apparent from my visit and the appellant's Heritage Impact Assessment that Crabb Street is a predominantly residential area comprising rows of two-storey terraced houses of uniformed design, built around the Grade II listed former boot and shoe factory. The significance of the listed building is derived from its historic use, its age and its architectural interest. The significance of the RCA is its development in the late 19<sup>th</sup> century as an industrial town comprising factory buildings and linear Victorian street patterns.
6. The appeal property is an end of terrace two-storey house with a traditional lower-level outrigger to the rear. It is situated in a prominent corner position, uphill from High Street, close to a car park and an area of open space, and with a footpath to

the rear. As such despite the dormer extension being to the rear of the property, it is visible in multiple public views, as well as from surrounding properties and gardens.

7. Despite some alterations to windows and doors, and some painting and rendering of brickwork, the terraced houses in the area retain their broader uniformity, with roof and building lines appearing largely untouched by alterations and extensions. The traditional scale and form of the terraced houses and their well preserved traditional roofscape form part of the significance of the RCA and make a positive contribution to its character and appearance.
8. The dormer roof extension is flush with the rear elevation and ridge line of the dwelling and is set in from the flank gable wall by only one tile. It covers almost the whole of the rear roof plane and extends above the lower part of the external chimney stack. It comprises a wide three pane window, which is not as shown on the plans and fails to align with or reflect the vertical emphasis of the original fenestration. Its grey rendered finish further detracts from the traditional design and materials that are prevalent in the area.
9. For all of these reasons, the dormer significantly detracts from the original roof form of the historic houses in this area and is detrimental to the character and appearance of the RCA, and to the historic setting of the adjacent listed building, which is viewed in context with the traditional modest terraced houses it is built amongst. This harm would not be addressed by making minor modifications to the scale, fenestration and external materials of the dormer. There is also no fallback position as permitted development rights do not exist for the enlargement of a dwelling consisting of an addition or alteration to its roof on properties located within conservation areas. This is no doubt why I saw no other large flat roof dormers in the area, and none have been brought to my attention.
10. The proposed development would result in less than substantial harm to the significance of the heritage assets. Nevertheless, in accordance with paragraph 212 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), great weight must be given to the conservation of heritage assets, irrespective of the level of harm. Paragraph 215 of the Framework states that where a development would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. No public benefits have been put to me that would outweigh the harm I have identified.
11. I therefore conclude that the proposal would be contrary to policies 2 and 8 of the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy 2011-2031 and policy 12 of the East Northamptonshire Local Plan part 2 2011-2031, which seek to ensure, amongst other things, that development responds to local character and conserves the significance of heritage assets and their settings. The proposal would also conflict with the Framework, in so far as it relates to the conservation and enhancement of the historic environment.

## **Conclusion**

12. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*R Bartlett* INSPECTOR