
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 February 2026

by **D Harris-Watkins BA(Hons) PgD MRICS**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 February 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/W2845/D/25/3374972

Ulverstone, North Street, Daventry, West Northamptonshire, NN11 4GJ

- 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 Neville Berrill against the decision of West Northamptonshire Council.
 - The application Ref is 2025/1468/FULL
 - The development proposed is single storey side extension to form annex and two storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The appellant has included within their overall appeal submission an additional plan to show the footprint of a different proposal that has previously gained consent at the property but was never implemented, to demonstrate the similarities between that scheme and the current appeal. Whilst the appeal process is not intended to be an opportunity to evolve a scheme or supply new evidence, the additional plan does not make any substantial difference or fundamental change to the appeal and would not result in any prejudice to the parties involved in the appeal, hence I have taken this into consideration.

Main Issue

3. The main issue of the appeal is the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the appeal site and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site comprises a detached dwelling and single garage on a large end plot. The dwelling has a relatively simple roof design with a single flat roofed dormer window on the front elevation and another to the rear. There is some variation in the use of materials on North Street, however the properties are generally of the same period and their appearance reflects that. Dormer windows are not typical of the character of the area with few examples evident.
5. North Street is a residential street adjacent to the town centre of Daventry. To the side and rear of the appeal site is an open green space. There is a footpath running through the green space and the appeal site is elevated above it, resulting in the dwelling being in a visually prominent location.

6. The proposed development comprises a single storey side extension and rear two storey extension, introducing multiple ridge lines and two additional pitched dormer windows, as well as altering the existing dormers to have pitched roofs.
7. The Designing House Extensions Supplementary Planning Document: Daventry District Council, advises that extensions should use a similar roof design to the existing house, and that dormer windows should be located to the rear.
8. Though the existing dwelling has two dormer windows this is an anomaly within the area. There is another property on North Street that has dormer windows; however, these are clearly not part of the construction of the original house, and I have not been provided any information whether these have been carried out with planning permission or otherwise. The introduction and proliferation of large, pitched dormer windows would dominate the front elevation of the host dwelling resulting in the design appearing incongruous, causing harm to the character and appearance of the area.
9. Due to the size of the proposed extension substantially increasing the massing of the host building, and its visually prominent location, the proposal would have a significant influence on the street scene. In combination with the proposed design, it would result in the development not integrating well with its surroundings and result in harm to the character of the area.
10. I conclude that the development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. Consequently, it would conflict with Policy ENV10-Design of the Settlements and Countryside Local Plan (Part 2) For Daventry District 2020 (the LP2), which seeks developments have a high quality of design and integrates with the surrounding area.

Other Matters

11. My attention has been drawn to a previous consent on the site for a different development. The date of the previous application would indicate that the consent has expired, and I have been provided with no evidence that the development has begun, nor have I been provided with a Certificate of Lawfulness showing the development can still be carried out. In any event I have determined the appeal on its own merits. I also note that the LP2 has been adopted since the previous application was made and therefore was in a different planning regime.
12. Concerns have been raised with the behaviour of West Northamptonshire Council (the Council) during the application process; however, this is a dispute for the appellant and the Council to resolve outside of the appeal process. The appellant has also stated they would have been willing to accept amendments to the proposals; however, I must determine the appeal based on the proposal before me.

Conclusion

13. The proposal conflicts with the development plan and there are no material considerations that indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

D Harris-Watkins

INSPECTOR