



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 October 2025

by K Winnard LL.B Hons Solicitor

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/M2840/D/25/3372737

8 Mauntley Avenue, Brigstock, North Northamptonshire NN14 3HF

- 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 Steve Matthews against the decision of North Northamptonshire Council.
 - The application Ref is NE/25/00541/FUL.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side extension, single storey front extension and change of materials.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed. Planning permission is granted for a two storey side extension, single storey front extension and change of materials at 8 Mauntley Avenue, Brigstock, North Northamptonshire NN14 3HF in accordance with the terms of the application NE/25/00541/FUL and the plans submitted with it subject to the following conditions:
 - (1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - (2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plan: Proposed Plans 17-25-02 B.
 - (3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be as shown on the plan drawing No. 17-25-02 B.

Procedural Matter

2. In the course of the application amended plans showing parking spaces in accordance with the North Northamptonshire Council Adopted Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document (NNC Parking Standards) were submitted by the appellant. The Council made its decision based on these plans. The appellant has asked me to consider two further revised drawings showing the same number of proposed parking bays (revision C) and revision D which reverts to two parking bays as originally proposed.
3. In general, the appeal process is not the appropriate place to evolve a scheme and the scheme that is considered at appeal ought to be the same one that was considered by the Council. It would not be appropriate to consider revision D within

my decision as my acceptance of such would deprive those who should have been consulted on the suggested changes or the opportunity of such consultation. Whilst revision C updates revision B to reflect the removal of a redundant street light, there is no written confirmation before me that this is to be the case. I will therefore base my decision solely upon the plans that were assessed by the Council during the original planning determination.

Main Issues

4. The main issues in the appeal are the effect of the proposal on (i) the character and appearance of the host dwelling and area and (ii) highway safety.

Reasons

Character and appearance

5. The appeal property, No 8 Mauntley Avenue, (No 8) is a previously extended detached property sited in a small residential estate of other similarly designed detached and semi-detached dwellings located in spacious plots. Some of the dwellings have been extended and these extensions have assimilated well into the streetscene. The road has a generally open aspect characterised by properties set back into the plot with a front garden separating it from the public highway. This gives the area a pleasant sub-urban feel and character.
6. The proposed two storey extension would be at the side of the dwelling, partly over an existing single storey extension. The Council suggest that this part of the proposal would unbalance the form and appearance of No 8. Notwithstanding that it would result in a materially wider frontage to the appeal property, it would be of a subservient design with a ridge height lower than that of the appeal property and a recessed front façade. Given the wide frontage of the appeal site, some space would be retained around the proposed extension and a gap with the neighbouring property would remain. Accordingly the proposed development would be a sympathetic addition to the host dwelling and would not detract from the scale and appearance of the line of development on this side of Mauntley Avenue.
7. Due to the size of the front garden the single storey front projection element of the extension would be positioned away from the front boundary of the appeal site and would not extend past the building line of the neighbouring dwelling. Rather than being confusing, its gable roof would reflect the main gable design of the host dwelling and would not be an incongruous addition in the context of the resultant dwelling such that it would cause material harm.
8. Turning to the proposed hardstanding, I noted on my site visit that whilst the majority of front garden areas on Mauntley Avenue are grassed with paved vehicular hardstandings/drives, there are a small number of properties with hardstanding to the front. Some soft landscaping would be lost as a result of the proposal. However, given that there are variations elsewhere on Mauntley Avenue this part of the appeal scheme incorporating a new access and parking bay would not be inappropriate within the prevailing character of the streetscene.
9. I therefore find that the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area. The proposal would therefore comply with Policies 8(d)(i) and (ii) of the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy 2011-2031 (adopted July 2016)(Core Strategy) which require, amongst other matters,

development to respond to the site's immediate and wider context and the overall character of the settlement. It would not be contrary to guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework which requires development to respond to local context and to guidance contained within the Householder Extensions Supplementary Planning Document in relation to the design of extensions.

Highway Safety

10. The proposal would introduce an additional vehicular access. However from my observations on site, given the openness I found in this location a good level of visibility can be obtained in both directions before starting a manoeuvre across the footway. In my view vehicles manoeuvring from a parking bay at No 8 are likely to do so at low speeds and as such would have sight of any oncoming vehicles, cyclists and pedestrians as they were crossing the footway. Further I found Mauntley Avenue to be within a quiet residential area which was lightly trafficked and with a low speed environment. Vehicles manoeuvring from driveways and within the road are to be expected in such areas and drivers are likely to be relatively alert to the potential for this occurring and to act with due caution. As such I do not share the concerns of the Council that an additional parking bay would result in manoeuvres from No 8 to the detriment of highway safety.
11. For the above reasons the development would not have a materially harmful effect on highway safety. Accordingly I find that it would not be contrary to Policy 8(b)(ii) of the Core Strategy which requires development to ensure provision for parking and manoeuvring in accordance with adopted standards. It would also not be in conflict with the NNC Parking Standards which requires development to provide usable parking without comprising highway safety.

Conditions and Conclusion

12. Conditions in respect of timescales and specifying the approved plans are necessary as these provide certainty. A condition regarding the materials to be used is also necessary to ensure that the appearance of the development is satisfactory.
13. Accordingly for the reasons given, I hereby allow the appeal as set out in the formal decision notice above.

K Winnard

INSPECTOR