



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/25/3372620

32 Orchard Lane, Woodnewton, Peterborough PE8 5EE

- 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 Simon Bullock against the decision of North Northamptonshire Council.
 - The application Ref is NE/25/00371/FUL.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension with a replacement garage with bedroom over. Attic conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed. Planning permission is granted for a single storey rear extension with a replacement garage with bedroom over, and an attic conversion at 32 Orchard Lane, Woodnewton, Peterborough PE8 5EE in accordance with the terms of the application, NE/25/00371/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 plans: Site and Location Plan 1613-P-01 (April 2025), Proposed Site Development Plan 1613-P-05, Proposed Elevations 1613-P-07, Proposed Elevations 1613-P-08, Proposed Ground Floor Layout 1613-P-09, Proposed First Floor Layout 1613-P-10 and Proposed Site Plan parking provisions 1613-P-11.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Procedural Matters

2. The appeal scheme consists of a number of elements, which in themselves would be distinct and severable. The Council raises no concern in relation to the single storey rear extension other than its cumulative impact together with the other elements of the proposal. I accordingly direct my assessment likewise.
3. The Council has queried the accuracy of the dimensions supplied on the plans submitted with the application. It determined the application on the basis of these plans. I am satisfied that there is adequate information before me and the submitted drawings allow me to determine the appeal with sufficient certainty.

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) the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring property by way of overlooking.

Reasons

Character and appearance

5. The appeal property, No 32 Orchard Lane, (No 32) is a detached bungalow set back from the highway within a spacious corner plot bounded by high hedging on its side boundaries. Orchard Lane is characterised by detached dwellings of varying scale, age and design set in relatively spacious plots.
6. The proposed design of the attic conversion, side and rear extensions would materially alter the appearance of No 32 and the resulting dwelling would be substantially larger than the existing dwelling. However this does not automatically equate to harm. The host dwelling has no special architectural merit to its design. The proposed changes to the front elevation would increase the bulk of the host dwelling and the pitched roof of the gable extension would be higher than the existing front gable. However, the attic conversion would be formed from the existing attic space and the proposal would retain the original gable positions and height of the existing dwelling. I do not consider that this unbalances the front elevation of the dwelling, nor unduly harms the original design of the host dwelling. The front gable's pitched roof would be below the ridge line of the host dwelling and the additions to the front elevation would be read in the context of a new façade. They would be of such scale and proportion that they would not dominate the form of the dwelling as enlarged.
7. The Council also raises concern that the side extensions would result in an enlarged dwelling which would be more than half the width of the original dwelling so extending the built form of No 32 closer to the boundary with Pridmore Close. Views of this part of the appeal site are limited to some degree by its angled layout and high dense planting along the boundary with Pridmore Close. The existing double garage is sited close to this boundary and is not readily visible in many public vantage views. Notwithstanding that the replacement garage would now be attached to the host dwelling, it would have a reduced footprint from the existing garage and would be set back from the front elevation of the dwelling with a pitched roof at a reduced height and a ridge line lower than the existing dwelling ridge.
8. These design features would help to achieve subservience and would prevent the dwelling having an unduly elongated appearance. The attached single storey workshop would be further set back and be of a subservient form. Given the significant articulation of the dwelling as enlarged, I do not find the resultant dwelling would appear unduly cramped within the plot itself. Whilst I appreciate the proposed development would be a sizeable addition, it would remain sympathetic to the appeal property due to its design, positioning and the size of the plot. Nor would it appear to be excessive within the streetscene given the variation of the style and design of the dwellings within the area.
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 (Extensions SPD) in relation to the design of extensions.

Living Conditions

10. Due to the appeal site's layout, No 32 sits at an angle with the adjacent dwelling, No 30A Orchard Lane (No 30A). Both dwellings have lengthy gardens and there is mature landscaping on either side of the boundary such that the occupiers of No 30A currently enjoy a high level of privacy. The proposed attic conversion would introduce a rear box dormer and gables with French casement inward opening doors set into the recess of the dormer and a glazed blanking balustrade. The dormer to the south east end of the roof closest to the boundary with No 30A would be blank. No roof terrace would be proposed within the scheme.
11. The proposed built development, due to its proximity with the boundary, would introduce an element of overlooking which does not exist presently. However, the main outlook from the proposed first floor doors of No 30 would be towards the north and down the rear garden of the appeal site and the angle of view towards No 30A would be limited. Given the juxtapositioning of the two dwellings, any views into parts of the garden area of No 30A which may occur would be away from the dwelling and its immediate private space and would be filtered in any event by the existing landscaping. Whilst I appreciate the concerns as to overlooking, some level of mutual overlooking is inevitable in residential areas. The degree of overlooking that would result in this instance would not be so unacceptable as to justify refusing the appeal.
12. I therefore conclude that on this issue, the proposal would not be contrary to Policies 8(e)(i) and (ii) of the Core Strategy, nor the Extensions SPD which requires development to protect amenity and not to result in an unacceptable impact on the amenities of the neighbouring properties by way of overlooking.

Conditions

13. 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.

Conclusion

14. I conclude that the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling nor the area. Nor would it unacceptably harm the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring dwelling. Accordingly for the reasons given, I hereby allow the appeal as set out in the formal decision notice above.

K Winnard

INSPECTOR