



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 August 2026

by A Edgington BSc (Hons) MA CMLi

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 August 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/W2845/W/25/3376013

The Rectory Farmhouse, Olden Road, Northampton, NN3 5DD

- 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 Tomasz Kozlowski against the decision of West Northamptonshire Council.
 - The application Ref is 2025/1410/FULL.
 - The development proposed is Proposed 4No. detached dwellings with associated driveways, amenity and bin storage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The application form states that the development is for four dwellings, but the decision notice and the appeal statement indicate that during the determination period this was changed to three dwellings. I have used Drawing 023-034-001 Rev G, referred to in the appeal statement, to inform my reasoning.
3. The appeal statement requests that Drawing 023-034-002 Rev C, Proposed Plot 1 Elevations, be considered in place of Drawing 023-034-002 Rev B. However, according to the appeal statement, it is revision B that was considered by the Council. Revisions to the original drawings are listed in Paragraph 1.7 of the appeal statement and Drawing 023-34-002 Rev C is not listed. To base my reasoning on a different drawing could be prejudicial to the Council and other parties. In any case, Revision C does not appear to have been submitted in the evidence.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the development on the living conditions of occupiers of 62 Lowmore Close, with particular regard to outlook.

Reasons

5. The development comprises three detached dwellings on an infill plot that abuts the rear garden boundaries of dwellings on Lowmore Close. Two dwellings, Plots 2 and 3, have modest L-shaped footprints and at the closest point, appear to be around 5 or 6 metres from the shared garden boundary.
6. However, Plot 1 is a much large dwelling, arranged side on to the shared boundary but at a far lesser distance. The plans indicate that there is 13.876 metres between

the rear elevation of 62 Lowmore Close (No 62) and the side elevation of Plot 1. The elevations show that the substantial side gable of Plot 1 would rise to some 9 metres above ground level. To the rear of the gable, the eaves would be around 5 metres high. Overall, the north facing elevation would appear substantial and overbearing, and the lack of openings would reinforce the impression of the dwelling's overall bulk and mass. This would lead to an oppressive sense of enclosure and an adverse effect on outlook for occupiers of No 62, which would be detrimental to their living conditions. It is also likely to have a significant overshadowing effect on No 62's garden.

8. The argument is advanced by the appellant that the north facing elevation would be Plot 1's side elevation, not its rear elevation. However, irrespective of how this elevation is identified, its nomenclature does not alter its overall bulk, its position or the likelihood of it reducing light at No 62 and having an adverse effect on No 62's living conditions. Moreover, given Plot 1's proposed floor plan there is some ambiguity as to which elevation could be called front, rear or side.
9. The appeal statement refers to a Residential Extensions and Alterations Guide (SPD). This sets out broad principles for separation and states that 13 metres would be sufficient for separation between back and front or side elevations. However, the supporting text says that these principles cannot always be applied successfully. It is also clear that this document is designed to inform domestic extensions and alterations, rather than new build dwellings. As such, it carries very little weight.
10. The appellant has highlighted other appeals where there was ambiguity regarding the identification of a dwelling's elevations. However as set out above, whatever the elevation is called, it would be overly tall and bulky in relation to No 62.
11. I acknowledge that Plots 2 and 3 have back to back separation distances that are also less than recommended in the SPD. However, this does not alter my reasoning with regard to Plot 1 which is the issue before me.
12. There would be an adverse effect on the living conditions of occupiers of No 62 which would be contrary to Policy H1 of the Core Strategy which is concerned with the impact of development on the amenities of occupiers of neighbouring properties, and Policy Q2 of the Local Plan which requires that new development does not have an overbearing effect on existing buildings or open spaces. It would also be contrary to Paragraph 137 f) of the National Planning Policy Framework which states that development should create places with a high standard of amenity of existing and future users.

Conclusion

13. The appeal is dismissed.

A Edgington

INSPECTOR