



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 May 2020 by Andreea Spataru BA (Hons) MA

Decision by Claire Searson MSc PGDip BSc (Hons) MRTPI IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8th June 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/B3030/D/20/3245925

30 Tuxford Road, Boughton, Nottinghamshire NG22 9HU

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mrs J Forth against the decision of Newark & Sherwood District Council.
 - The application Ref 19/01971/FUL, dated 31 October 2019, was refused by notice dated 24 December 2019.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two story side extension at 30 Tuxford Road, Boughton, Nottinghamshire NG22 9HU in accordance with the terms of application Ref 19/01971/FUL, dated 31 October 2019 and subject to the following conditions:
 1. The development hereby permitted shall begin no 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 (drawing no. 1321/3), Block Plan (drawing no. 1321/2), Existing and proposed elevations and floor plans (drawing no. 1321/1A).
 3. The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer 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 proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the adjoining semi-detached property, and of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal property is a semi-detached, two-storey, pitched roofed dwelling located on a corner plot. The appeal dwelling is set-back from Tuxford Road and significantly set-in from the western side boundary. The large side garden and the low boundary treatment to the side and front of the appeal property
-

contribute to openness at the junction of Tuxford Road with Greenwood Crescent.

5. The plot of the appeal property is significantly larger than those of the neighbouring properties located within proximity of the site. No 32 Tuxford Road, which is the pair of the appeal property, has a significantly narrower plot. No 1 Greenwood Crescent, which occupies the corner plot opposite the appeal site, also has a narrower plot and a different orientation to the appeal dwelling. Opposite the appeal property, on the southern side of Tuxford Road, are allotment gardens bounded by a hedgerow and trees. The wider area comprises of pairs of semi-detached dwellings along Tuxford Road and Greenwood Close.
6. The proposal would provide a two-storey extension to the side, which would occupy part of the side garden. The extension would project along the full depth of the two-storey dwelling, would be slightly set-back from the front elevation and set-down from the main ridge. Whilst the extension would increase the width of the original dwelling by around 60%, given the particularities of this plot, the siting of the extension in relation to the host dwelling and its overall form, the proposal would appear proportionate and subordinate to the host property. The matching roof style and materials would also ensure that the extension is well incorporated into the original dwelling.
7. Moreover, whilst the extension would increase the overall mass and scale of the host dwelling, given the size of the plot and the siting of the extension in relation to the host dwelling, the development would not unbalance the pair of semi-detached properties to such an extent that would be detrimental to their appearance. Thus, the proposal would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the adjoining semi-detached property.
8. Given the significant set-back of the extension from the front and western side boundaries, a large amount of the existing garden would be retained. This would ensure that the extension does not have a detrimental effect on the openness of the area. The set-back from the front elevation would also ensure that the general uniformity and pattern of development formed by the semi-detached properties is not affected to a significant degree. Furthermore, the extension would be located within the built up part of the street scene, which is clearly separated from the green area on the southern side of Tuxford Road. Notwithstanding the open and prominent position of the appeal site, given the siting, form and materials of the extension, the development would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the area.
9. In light of the above, I conclude that the proposal would not adversely affect the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the adjoining semi-detached property nor would it be unduly prominent in the area. Consequently, the development would not conflict with Core Policy 9 of the Amended Core Strategy and Policies DM5 and DM6 of the Allocations & Development Management Development Plan Document, which collectively require, amongst other things, developments to reflect the design, materials and detailing of the host dwelling and to respect the character of the surrounding area.

Conditions and Recommendation

10. In the interests of proper planning and to provide certainty I have recommended the standard time limit condition and have specified the

approved plans. In order to protect the character and appearance of the area a condition that specifies that matching materials are used in the development is necessary. These conditions have also been suggested by the Council in the event that the appeal was allowed.

11. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed subject to these conditions.

Andreea Spataru

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

12. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed.

C Searson

INSPECTOR