



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 26 October 2021

by Benjamin Clarke BA (Hons.) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5th November 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/B3030/D/21/3277122

Uno Cottage, The Turnpike, Halam NG22 8AE

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr & Mrs Stuart & Pippa Bond against the decision of Newark & Sherwood District Council.
 - The application Ref 21/00437/HOUSE, dated 22 February 2021, was refused by notice dated 26 April 2021.
 - The development proposed is a first-floor extension and porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for a first-floor extension and porch at Uno Cottage, The Turnpike, Halam NG22 8AE in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/00437/HOUSE, dated 22 February 2021, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Location Plan; 445_2019_02; 445_2019_03; and 445_2019_04.
 - 3) Full details of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be submitted to, and approved in writing, by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of any above ground works. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Main Issue

2. The main issue relevant to this appeal is the effect of the development upon the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site consists of a semi-detached dwelling located perpendicular to the road. The appellant's dwelling has been extended through the provision of a front extension, constructed with a 'cat-slide' roof, which terminates below the eaves of the main part of the house and a rear extension. The adjoining dwelling has also been the subject of an extension. The proposed development would result in an enlarged extension. However, whilst the appellant's dwelling is a semi-detached house, there is not a significant amount of symmetry between the appeal site and the neighbouring house. This occurs because of

- extensions to the front and rear elevation of the appellant's dwelling, as well as extensions to the neighbouring house.
4. Therefore, whilst the proposed extension would not be replicated at the neighbouring dwelling, the development would not be incongruous given that it would not erode a sense of symmetry between the two buildings.
 5. The appeal site and some neighbouring dwellings have been arranged so that they are perpendicular to the road. Whilst this creates a relationship between the various dwellings, they have been constructed to different designs and proportions. In result, the proposed development would not result in adverse effect upon the character of the surrounding area as the proposed development would be viewed against a backdrop of differently designed buildings.
 6. In addition, owing to the pattern of development in the surrounding area, the proposed extension would be relatively well screened, which would ensure that it would not be overly prominent within the surrounding area.
 7. One of the side elevations of the proposed extension would be viewable from the road. However, this is seen against a context of differently designed buildings. Moreover, the proposed extension would be set back from the original side elevation of the dwelling and would feature a lower ridge height. It would also have the same footprint as the existing front extension. The proposed porch would, by reason of its proportions, not be readily apparent from the wider area.
 8. Therefore, the proposed development would be a subordinate addition to the existing dwelling. In addition, the feature of a gable end facing the highway would still be apparent and the main feature when viewed from the road. As such, the development would not be injurious to the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
 9. I have been referred to the Council's Householder Development Supplementary Planning Document (2014) (the SPD). Whilst the proposed development would feature first-floor windows of a different height to other windows on the dwelling, the degree of difference would not be large. In addition, the height of windows would be similar to those used on the existing rear extension. Therefore, although the requirements of the SPD would be breached, this would not amount to harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
 10. There is some debate as to whether the appeal site is a non-designated heritage asset. However, even if I were to agree with the Council, I would find that as the proposed development would maintain the gable facing the street as the main architectural feature, that the proposed development would be a subordinate addition to the building and constructed from appropriate materials, I do not believe that the development would result in harm in this regard.
 11. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would not have an adverse effect upon the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The development, in this regard, would comply with Policies CM9 and CM14 of the Newark and Sherwood Amended Core Strategy (2019); and Policies DM6 and DM9 of the Newark and Sherwood Local Development Framework (2013). Amongst other matters, this seek to ensure that new developments are of a

high standard of sustainable design; conserve and enhance the character and appearance of the historic environment; respect the design of the host building; and utilise appropriate design, details and materials.

Conditions

12. In addition to the standard implementation condition, a condition specifying the approved plans is necessary in the interests of precision. In addition, to ensure that the development harmonises with its surroundings, a condition that would enable the Council to agree details of the external materials is necessary and reasonable. However, I have amended the wording suggested by the Council to allow for any underground works, such as foundations, to be commenced and to create a more precise trigger point for the agreement of such details.

Conclusion

13. For the preceding reasons, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed, and planning permission granted.

Benjamin Clarke

INSPECTOR