

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 January 2017

by P Eggleton BSc(Hons) MRTPI

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

Decision date: 30 January 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/A3010/D/16/3163669

Greenfields, Main Street, Laneham, Nottinghamshire DN22 0ND

- 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 and Mrs A Morris against the decision of Bassetlaw District Council.
 - The application Ref 16/01190/HSE, dated 30 August 2016, was refused by notice dated 3 November 2016.
 - The development proposed is a 1.5 storey side extension, rear dormer and alterations to dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect on the character and appearance of the area; and the effect on the living conditions of the residents of Miles End Cottage with regard to outlook.

Reasons

3. The proposal would result in the re-modelling of this property, including a new two storey element close to the eastern boundary. The altered dwelling would have a relatively unified and contemporary appearance, with improved design interest compared to the existing. The new materials would add to the quality of the design. Although there are many traditional dwellings in the vicinity, the settlement also includes a wide variety of property types and ages and this more modern design approach would not be out of keeping within the wider setting.
 4. The dwelling is set significantly back from the front building line of the neighbouring property to the east. This reduces its impact on the street scene. However, the new two storey element would extend close to the boundary with Miles End Cottage and the new relationship would result in it appearing relatively cramped within the plot. The extended dwelling would not have a sufficiently spacious setting in which to satisfactorily accommodate the new design and it would not therefore, sit comfortably alongside its neighbour.
 5. Because of the cramped layout and poor relationship with the neighbouring property, the proposal would detract from the character and appearance of the
-

area. It would be contrary to the design principles of Policy DM4(B)(i & ii) of the Bassetlaw Core Strategy & Development Management Policies Development Plan Document 2011 as it would fail to respect the wider surroundings or the immediate context.

6. The Council have also raised concerns with regard to the impact of the side extension on the amenities of the neighbouring residents. The adjacent property has a large window that faces a surfaced garden area to the rear, close to the boundary. The new works, although set in from the fence, would extend significantly beyond the position of the neighbouring window. The new roof would slope away from the boundary but its eaves would be in the region of 3.9 metres high.
7. The scale of the development, including the new roof, would enclose the adjacent garden area. Although the dwelling has other areas of garden, the proposed works would unacceptably reduce the outlook from both the rear facing room and part of the garden of the neighbouring property. It would be unacceptably harmful to the living conditions of the residents of Miles End Cottage and it would conflict with the amenity requirements of Policy DM4(B)(v).
8. I have considered all the matters put forward by the appellants. However, I have not found them to outweigh my concerns, including the conflict with Policy DM4. As the policy generally accords with the design and amenity requirements of the *National Planning Policy Framework*, it should be afforded considerable weight. I therefore dismiss the appeal.

Peter Eggleton

INSPECTOR