



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 January 2026

by R Bartlett PGDip URP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 January 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/M2840/D/25/3374045

29 Glamis Close, Rushden, NN10 0QP

- 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 Sembhi against the decision of North Northamptonshire Council.
 - The application Ref is NE/25/00626/FUL.
 - The development proposed is single storey side/rear extension to be linked to proposed conversion to garage with garage to be further widened.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The proposal is a resubmission of a previously refused scheme. The main difference is that the proposed side extension would now have a lean to roof rather than a flat roof, and the existing garage would retain its pitched roof but would be widened, rather than retaining its existing footprint and having its roof lowered to be flat. The widening of the garage would result in excavations close to trees in neighbouring gardens, which resulted in an additional reason for refusal.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on i) the character and appearance of the host dwelling and its immediate surroundings; and ii) trees and wildlife.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal property comprises a detached family home with a narrow driveway to the side leading to a detached garage at the rear. It has previously been extended up to the southern boundary of the plot at ground floor level. The proposed extension would fill the gap between the other side of the house and the northern boundary of the plot.
5. Following a previous refusal, the design of the extension has been revised to incorporate a lean to pitched roof. However, the proposal continues to extend up to the northern boundary of the plot. The proposed extension also remains almost flush with the front elevation of the dwelling and its original projecting front gable feature, increasing its visual prominence. The roof style fails to reflect that of the existing dwelling, the previous extension to it or others visible in the cul-de-sac.

6. For the above reasons, the development would not be in keeping with the design and appearance of the dwelling or neighbouring properties and would result in the plot appearing cramped, in what is already a very cramped cul-de-sac. Consequently, the proposal would be contrary to Policy 8 of the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy 2011-2031 (the JCS), and Policy EN1 of the Rushden Neighbourhood Plan 2018, which amongst other things require development to respond to the sites immediate and wider context and local character.
7. I have not been provided with a copy of the Council's Household Extensions Supplementary Planning Document or referred to any specific part of the National Design Guide, and as such these documents have not influenced my decision.

Trees and wildlife

8. The proposal would not require the removal of any existing trees. The garage is existing and the proposed widening of it is minimal, comprising the construction of a new external wall just outside of the existing one. The foundation requirements of this would have a negligible effect on the roots of neighbouring trees given the presence of the existing structure and the limited change in separation distance between them. I am not advised that any trees are protected, and if not, any overhanging branches could be trimmed back if required.
9. Any bird boxes on the rear fence would be unaffected, and any on the side fence affected by the proposed side extension up to that boundary could be removed or relocated outside of nesting season, should they be in use.
10. Based upon the evidence before me, I am satisfied that the proposal would not be detrimental to the long-term health of nearby trees, or to nesting birds, subject to suitable mitigation measures that could be conditioned. Consequently, the proposal would accord with Policy 4 of the JCS, which seeks amongst other things to protect existing biodiversity assets.

Conclusion

11. Although I do not consider the proposed development would result in any harm to trees or wildlife, it would fail to respect the character and appearance of the host property and its immediate surroundings. Accordingly, it would fail to accord with the development plan, and no material considerations have been put before me that would indicate a decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan.
12. For the reasons given above, the appeal is dismissed.

R Bartlett

INSPECTOR