
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 December 2025 by T Morris BA (Hons) MSc

Decision by A M Nilsson BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 05 March 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/M2840/W/25/3372843

32 St Johns Road, Kettering, North Northamptonshire NN15 5AY

- 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 Guy Maddison against the decision of North Northamptonshire Council.
 - The application Ref is NK/2024/0729.
 - The development proposed is a detached self-build dwelling on underutilised garden land.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site is located at the corner plot of St Johns Road and Wingate Close, within a housing estate. The area is generally characterised by two-storey dwellings which are of a similar scale and appearance. The dwellings at corner plots typically have open garden land to the side, which contributes to an open and verdant character at the road junctions in the estate. Even where corner plots have been developed, this is mostly in the form of single storey extensions which tend to be subservient to the host dwellings. Where there are two-storey extensions at corner plots, these are also mostly set in from the highway and thus also respect the open character of corner plots in the area.
5. Similarly, the appeal site comprises an open corner plot which forms part of the side garden of the host property. The property is sited at a higher level than the dwellings on Wingate Close. The site is currently grassed as well as being open and free of development, so much so that it provides views down to the trees and open space at the bottom of Wingate Close. Therefore, with its open and spacious character as well as its contribution to the verdant feel in the estate, the appeal site positively contributes to the character and appearance of the area.
6. The external appearance of the proposed dwelling would be appropriate in this context, as it would generally mirror the dwelling on the opposite side of the

junction of St Johns Road and Wingate Close. However, the dwelling on the opposite side is set well in from the footpath with a sizeable garden area to the side which includes trees. Furthermore, I observed on my site visit that when viewed from towards the bottom of Wingate Close, it is not significantly forward of the building line set by the front elevations of the nearest dwellings on Wingate Close. It therefore retains its positive contribution to the open character of the area.

7. In contrast, due to the scale of the proposed dwelling and its siting in close proximity to the footpath, it would be an unacceptably prominent feature at the corner plot and would erode its open character. Furthermore, despite what is depicted on the proposed street scene plan, the proposed dwelling would project further than the front elevations of the nearest dwellings on Wingate Close, thus emphasising its conspicuous presence in the street scene. Its position at a higher level than the dwellings on Wingate Close would also exacerbate its physical presence on the corner plot and the subsequent erosion of its open and spacious character. Consequently, the proposed dwelling would appear incongruous in the street scene and as such, it would be significantly harmful to the character and appearance of the area.
8. In drawing these conclusions, I have considered all of the examples referred to by the appellant and I observed some of these on my site visit. However, the majority of the examples referred to on St Johns Road are extensions to existing dwellings. That is not the same as the appeal proposal. Furthermore, from the evidence before me, the extensions generally appear subservient in scale to their respective host dwellings and thus reduce their physical presence on the corner plots. The two-storey sections of the extensions also appear to be setback from the footpath which ensures that the open and spacious nature of the corner plots is respected more so than the appeal proposal.
9. Although the example at 94 St Johns Road appears to be more similar to the appeal proposal because it shows a new dwelling on a corner plot, it appears to be set in from the footpath more so than the appeal proposal. Furthermore, unlike the appeal proposal it appears broadly in line with the side elevation of the property on the corner of Glencoe Drive and Oban Close. Therefore, it better respects the prevailing character of corner plots on the estate. Furthermore, I do not have the full planning background for this development in order to give it significant weight. In any case, I have considered the appeal on its own merits.
10. Overall, whilst I accept that there are several developments on corner plots in the estate, for the reasons I have explained, none of these justify the proposed development. Therefore, I conclude that the proposal would be significantly harmful to the character and appearance of the area. It would conflict with Policy 8 of the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy 2011 – 2031 (2016) (JCS), which amongst other matters, seeks high quality developments which respond to the site's immediate and wider context and the local character.
11. It would also conflict with the guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), which amongst other matters, states that developments should add to the overall quality of the area as well as being sympathetic to the local character.

Other Matters

12. The appellant refers to paragraph 11 of the Framework, which for decision-taking, means approving development proposals that accord with an up-to-date development plan without delay. I have, however, found that the proposal would not accord with the development plan. Consequently, it would not contribute to the achievement of sustainable development as is required by the Framework.
13. While not referred to by the Council, the appellant refers to compliance with Policy EN11 of the 'North Northamptonshire Local Plan Part 2 (2023)'. I have not been provided a copy of this policy. From the evidence before me, the policy seems to require that developments integrate positively, create visual interest, reflect local distinctiveness and provide sufficient amenity space. As is already set out, the proposal would not fully accord with these objectives.
14. I also acknowledge the benefits of the proposed development in terms of providing a self-build home which there is a need for, and which would contribute to housing supply in the area. I also accept that the site is in a sustainable residential location. However, these benefits are not of a sufficient magnitude in order to justify the harm of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.
15. Finally, the absence of objections from consultees, residents and the Town Council are neutral factors which do not weigh in favour of the proposal.

Conclusion and Recommendation

16. The proposed development would be contrary to the development plan as a whole and there are no other material planning considerations which would outweigh this conflict. Therefore, I recommend that the appeal is dismissed.

T Morris

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

17. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

A M Nilsson

INSPECTOR