
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 March 2017

by L Fleming BSc (Hons) MRTPI

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

Decision date: 24 March 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/A3010/D/17/3169358

6 Radford Street, Worksope S80 2NH

- 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 Nigel Raisbeck against the decision of Bassetlaw District Council.
 - The application Ref 16/00595/HSE, dated 30 March 2016, was refused by notice dated 14 December 2016.
 - The development proposed is a 2 storey side extension and conversion of roof space.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effects of the proposed development on the:
 - character and appearance of the area;
 - living conditions of the occupants of No 4 Radford Street (No 4) with particular regard to outlook and light

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. No 6 Radford Street is a two storey semi-detached dwelling with a hipped roof. It is in a residential area where the dwellings are all set a similar distance from the road with relatively even spaces between the buildings which are all of a similar style and finished in similar materials. Thus, the residential area nearby has a relatively uniform and formal character and appearance.
 4. I acknowledge that planning permission was granted in 2007 by the Council for an extension which I am told is identical to that proposed. However, the full details of that scheme are not before me and in any event that planning permission has now lapsed and thus no longer exists as a fall-back position.
 5. The roofs of the majority of the properties nearby are relatively simple and I did not notice any dormer windows of a similar style to that proposed. Even though some of the properties in the area have gable ends, the proposed dormer window and gable end, would appear noticeably at odds with the simple hipped roof of the adjoining semi-detached property. Due to these contrasting features the proposed extension would be an incongruous feature
-

of street scene which would be harmful to the relatively formal and uniform character and appearance of the area.

6. For these reasons, the proposed development would be in conflict with Policy DM4 of the Bassetlaw Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (2011) (CSDMP) which seeks to ensure new development is of a high quality design and responds to local character and distinctiveness. For the same reasons it would also be in conflict with the good design aims of the Successful Places – A Guide to Sustainable Housing Layout and Design Supplementary Planning Document (2013) (SPD).

Living Conditions

7. No 4 has a number of windows in its side elevation facing the appeal site including a ground floor kitchen window. I acknowledge the effect of the existing side elevation of the appeal property and carport on light enjoyed through and views from the windows of No 4 which face the appeal site.
8. However, the proposed extension would be significantly taller than the carport. In my view, the introduction of such a bulk of development so close to so many windows would significantly reduce the amount of light entering No 4. Furthermore, the view from these windows directly onto a tall blank side elevation of solid brickwork would feel oppressive and overbearing.
9. For these reasons, I find the proposed development would result in harmful living conditions for the occupants of No 4 with particular regard to outlook and light. Thus, it would be in conflict with Policy DM4 of the CSDMP and the SPD, which, taken together, aim to ensure good design and protect the amenities of nearby residents.

Other Matters

10. I acknowledge that the appellant is dissatisfied with the Councils handling of the planning application. I have also noted that there are no objections to the proposed development from residents living nearby. However, I have dealt with the appeal on its planning merits and these matters or any others raised do not outweigh the harm I have identified.

Conclusion

11. Overall, I find the proposed development is in conflict with the development plan and thus having had regard to all other matters raised I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

L Fleming

INSPECTOR