

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 April 2017

by D. M. Young BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI MIHE

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

Decision date: 12 April 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/B3030/D/17/3169639
East View, Fosse Road, Brough NG23 7QE.

- 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 Marc Greenfield against the decision of Newark & Sherwood District Council.
 - The application Ref 16/01600/FUL, dated 29 September 2016, was refused by notice dated 20 December 2016.
 - The development proposed is a two storey extension to dwelling house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two storey extension to dwelling house at East View, Fosse Road, Brough NG23 7QE in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 16/01600/FUL, dated 29 September 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 1:1250 site location plan, 16/009 P14, 16/009 P13 and 16/009 P15.

Main Issue

2. This is the effect of the extension upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises a two-storey dwelling occupying an isolated position on the western side of Fosse Road. Although the property is attractive and well-proportioned in relation to its plot, I do not find anything inherently sensitive about it in architectural terms that would preclude the principle of an extension. The appeal property addresses the road with an open aspect across the surrounding agricultural landscape to the front and rear. The surrounding area is lightly settled and unmistakably rural. Where built development exists it tends to be set out in a loose linear form along Fosse Road.
 4. The Council refer several times to the prevailing character of the area but fail to set out exactly what that is. As I saw when I conducted my site visit, the area has a spacious and bucolic character. Nonetheless, there is little uniformity in the style of dwellings, their age, size or even their relationship to
-

- Fosse Road. Consequently, it cannot be said that the area displays any defining characteristics that ought to be reflected in the proposed extension.
5. Core Policy 9 of the "*Local Development Framework: Core Strategy*" (the CS) seeks a high standard of design that reinforces local distinctiveness. Collectively Policies DM5 and DM6 of the "*Local Development Framework Allocations & Development Management*" (the DMP) support house extensions provided they meet a range of criteria, which includes, respecting the design, materials and detailing of the host dwelling as well as the character of the area.
 6. There is little doubt that the proposed two-storey extension would significantly increase the size of the existing dwelling. The sub-text to Policy DM6¹ states, amongst other things, that development which is subservient can be accommodated without detriment to the surrounding area. It does not go as far to say that extensions should always be subservient in scale as suggested by the Council. Irrespective of the precise wording of the supporting text, there is no reference to subservience within the text of the policy itself.
 7. In this instance, the extension, although large and set forward of the existing dwelling, would still be set back comfortably from the front of the plot and Fosse Road. The Council argue that the dwelling would have an appearance akin to a pair of semi-detached dwellings. Even if I were to accept that proposition, there is a pair of semi-detached dwellings to the south of the appeal site and therefore I fail to see how this could be said to be out of character.
 8. The design of the extension in terms of its detailing and materials would closely reflect those of the host dwelling. Its proportions and layout including the large projecting gable would fundamentally change the appearance of the host dwelling but not in a way that could reasonably be categorised as harmful given the varied style and orientation of dwellings in the locality. In any event, Policy DM6 acknowledges a degree of change is inevitable.
 9. Overall, there would be a material change to the appearance of the host dwelling and some modest change to the character and appearance of the area. However, for the reasons given above, I find that this would not be at a level to cause unacceptable harm or to bring the proposal into conflict with the development plan. Accordingly there would be no conflict with Core Policy 9 of the CS or Policies DM5 and DM6 of the DMP.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above and taking into account all other matters, I conclude that the appeal should succeed. The Council has not suggested any conditions I have therefore imposed a condition specifying the approved plans as this provides certainty.

D. M. Young

Inspector

¹ Paragraph 7.33