



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 November 2025

by **K E Down MA(Oxon) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W2845/D/25/3373797

5 The Paddock, Lower Boddington, West Northamptonshire, NN11 6YF

- 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 Ross Irving against the decision of West Northamptonshire Council.
 - The application Ref is 2024/5238/FULL.
 - The development proposed is a first floor front extension, garage extension, internal alterations and associated works.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. There is one main issue which is the effect of the proposed front extension and garage extension on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene of The Paddock.

Reasons

3. The appeal dwelling is a modern, detached two storey dwelling set on a generous plot in an established cul-de-sac of similarly aged dwellings. Some of these, like the appeal dwelling, have side gables with a single storey forward facing projection to the front elevation. In others the gable end forms the principal elevation and is generally orientated towards the street. The appeal plot has a single storey detached garage with a flat roof that is set at an angle to the dwelling.
4. The proposed front extension would project forwards by the same distance as the existing single storey projection and would add a first floor above it, with a front facing gable roof. The forward projection would be modest at some 2.2m in depth which is less than half the depth of the main house. Its width would be around two thirds that of the main façade, the same as the existing front projection. The roof height would match that of the existing dwelling with the ridge joining with the main ridge at a right angle. Although the extension would be prominent in the street scene, it would not be excessive in scale in the context of the dwelling as a whole. Moreover, the front facing gable would reflect the existing side elevations and echo the design of those nearby dwellings with their principal elevation in the gable end.
5. Overall, in terms of scale, massing, siting and form, I find that the proposed extension would be a subservient addition, notwithstanding its prominent location on the front elevation. The Council refers to potential conflict with guidance in the

South Northamptonshire Design Guide (DG), 2017 relating to front extensions. However, whilst this is a material planning consideration it will not be applicable in every case and each development must be assessed on its own merits, which I have done.

6. Nevertheless, I am concerned that the extension lacks the degree of design detail that is seen in the existing dwelling, elsewhere in The Paddock and which might be expected on a principal elevation. For example, the existing dwelling has noticeably overhanging eaves and part weatherboarding to the single storey front projection, which add character and interest. These, or any equivalent detailing, appear absent from the proposed extension, giving it a bland appearance which would be at odds with and detract from the character and appearance of the dwelling as a whole and the street scene of The Paddock.
7. Policy SS2 of the South Northamptonshire Part 2 Local Plan, 2011-2029 (LP), adopted 2020, expects new development to demonstrate compatibility and integration with its surroundings and distinctive local character in terms of , amongst other things, design and details. Moreover, LP Policy SDP1 expects residential extensions to incorporate good quality design which maintains or enhances the character and appearance of the host building and the street scene. The proposed extension would fail to comply with these requirements which reflect the emphasis placed on good design in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which says that the creation of high quality buildings is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve and that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development. It goes on to say that development should be visually attractive as a result of good architecture. In view of the policy conflict at both local and national levels, I conclude that the proposed extension should not be allowed.
8. Turning to the proposed garage extension, this would noticeably widen the existing building to some 5.66m, bringing it closer to the dwelling, and it would be extended in length to the rear to some 7.79m. The flat roof would be replaced with a pitched roof with front gable that would have a ridgeline at approximately the same height as the first floor eave of the dwelling.
9. I am satisfied that the proposed overall footprint of the garage would not be excessive, either in itself or in relation to its location on or the size and shape of the plot. Moreover, the separation distance between the garage and the dwelling would be sufficient to avoid a cramped appearance in respect of the relationship between the two.
10. Nevertheless, the pitched roof would be a noticeably tall and bulky structure that would appear disproportionately large in relation to the dwelling and incongruous in the street scene, where other garages either have flat roofs or pitched roofs that finish well below the level of the first floor eaves. In view of its conspicuous location in the street and its position close to the host dwelling and to a bungalow to the rear, I find it would be an unacceptably intrusive and unsympathetic addition that would result in the proposed garage as a whole failing to show compatibility or integration with its surroundings in terms of scale, mass, form and design. This would be in conflict with LP Policy SS2 and with the NPPF.
11. I note that, according to the appellant, the garage was designed to be similar to another in the local area. However, I did not see any similar structure in The

Paddock. Beyond this street the style of buildings varies significantly. As a result, what may be acceptable elsewhere would not necessarily be acceptable at the appeal site.

12. It is concluded on the main issue that the proposed front extension and garage extension would, as a consequence of their design and/or scale, have a materially detrimental effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene of The Paddock. In consequence, they would conflict with LP Policies SS2 and SDP1 and with the NPPF.
13. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

KE Down
INSPECTOR