
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 November 2016

by R W Allen B.Sc PGDip MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 15 December 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/N1025/D/16/3159876

8 Buckingham Road, Sandiacre, Derbyshire NG10 5PP

- 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 Mr Simon Judson against the decision of Erewash Borough Council.
 - The application Ref ERE/0516/0050, dated 31 May 2016, was refused by notice dated 15 July 2016.
 - The development proposed is rear ground floor extension and first floor side and front extension to dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for rear ground floor extension and first floor side and front extension to dwelling at 8 Buckingham Road, Sandiacre, Derbyshire NG10 5PP in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref ERE/0516/0050, dated 31 May 2016, 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: Site Location Plan; GD/SJKE/15/050/01 and GD/SJKE/15/050/10.
 - 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.

Preliminary Matter

2. I am told that an extant planning permission already exists for the property to be extended to the side and rear as shown on the submitted drawings. The Council's objection relates only to the proposed two-storey front extension. With no other representations before me to the contrary, I shall therefore concern myself only with this element of the scheme in my Decision.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a two-storey detached dwelling, one of a number of similar style properties in the area. With the exception of No 25 Buckingham Road, none that I saw had been extended to the front at first floor level, and the proposal would in that respect depart from the established character of the area.
5. However, the proposal would extend only partly across the width of the front elevation, and would project no further forward than the property currently does so at ground floor level. I do not find that it would be significant in size. While a gabled element would be introduced, I am not persuaded that the property would as a result appear complex or fussy, or that it would amount to a discordant or disharmonious addition to it. Furthermore, I observed at my site visit that the proposed front extension would not be readily visible or appreciable from any point in the street except when generally viewed directly outside the appeal property, and its effects on the character of the street scene would be therefore be limited.
6. I am therefore satisfied that the proposed front extension would not appear as a prominent or significantly harmful addition to the street scene. It would, I find, accord with Policy 10 of the Erewash Core Strategy 2014 and saved policy DC2 of the Erewash Local Plan 2008. These state that all new development should be designed to make a positive contribution to the public realm, and reinforce valued local characteristics, and that the scale, design and external materials of a proposed extension is in keeping with the dwelling to be extended, neighbouring properties and the surrounding area. It would also accord with the Council's guidance entitled 'Extending Your Home' and with the relevant parts of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework)

Conditions

7. I have considered the conditions suggested by the Council against paragraph 206 of the Framework, and made changes necessary to comply with those requirements. I have specified the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning. A condition relating to materials is necessary to ensure the appearance of the development would be satisfactory.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

R Allen

INSPECTOR