

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 May 2017

**by Mrs A Fairclough MA BSc(Hons) LLB(Hons) PGDip (Barrister) MRTPI
IHBC**

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

Decision date: 20 June 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/B3030/D/17/3172589

2 Forest Side, Blythe Road, Ollerton NG22 9DY

- 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 Kevin Matthews against the decision of Newark and Sherwood District Council.
 - The application Ref: 16/02092/FUL, dated 13 December 2016, was refused by notice dated 10 February 2017.
 - The development proposed is described as a “two storey rear extension”.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the locality.

Reasons

3. No. 2 Forest Side is the middle house in a row of 3 similar dwellings clustered together on Blythe Road near to the large roundabout junction of Ollerton Road, Newark Road, Mansfield Road, Old Rufford Road and Workshop Road. It is located in the countryside. The dwelling is two-storey with rooms in the roof and is built of brick with a tiled roof and low eaves. The property has been extended previously including a conservatory, a rear extension and a side extension. There are views of the rear of No 2 and the adjacent dwellings across nearby agricultural land from Ollerton Road.
 4. The proposed extension would align with the original side wall of the host dwelling and would project some 5m at ground floor level, beyond the existing rear extension into a substantial rear garden. At first floor level it would have a depth of some 8m and the ridge, which would be the same height as the ridge of the host dwelling, would be around 10m in length. It would be around 5.9m wide.
 5. The proposed extension would be a similar size to the original dwelling. Although set in from the existing ground floor rear elevation, it would appear large especially as the land slightly falls away towards the River Maun. I consider that the two-storey extension would appear tall and bulky and as such would create a dominant and prominent feature when viewed from rear of the adjacent properties. Also given its mass form and height, it would fail to balance with the scale and proportions of the host dwelling.
-

6. Furthermore, although views of the proposed rear extension from Blythe Road are limited, as there is a single storey side extension that blocks some of the views between the appeal dwelling and the adjacent dwelling, it would be very visible across agricultural land from Ollerton Road. It would appear very prominent alongside the modest dwellings and smaller domestic sheds and outbuildings and against the backdrop of Sherwood Forest beyond.
7. I note that the appellant states that the appeal site is only some 367m from the settlement boundary of Ollerton. However, it is located outside the settlement and in the countryside and this is the local distinctive character against which it should be assessed. The appellant refers to the commercial retail development on the roundabout as forming part of the immediate character of the local area and that the appeal scheme would not be out of place, these structures are slightly away from the appeal dwelling and do not form part of its setting. Therefore, I disagree with the appellant's assertion.
8. I note that the appellant states that the proposed extension would be some distance from Ollerton Road. However, although the dwellings appear small from Blythe Road, they are more prominent when viewed from Ollerton Road due to the way the land falls gently away towards the river. Consequently the structures and buildings to the rear of the appeal property and its neighbours are highly visible above the fences, hedges and between/above the trees. The proposed development would be significantly larger than the substantial brick garage referred to by the appellant and as such it would appear strident when viewed from Ollerton Road. Thus a new development of this size would create a dominant and incongruous addition, which would appear prominent when viewed from this aspect.
9. I note that the Council refers to the proposed extension in terms of a percentage increase and that there are no specific policies to restrict extension sizes in terms of percentages. I also acknowledge that the appellant refers to other large extensions in the locality. However, I have not been provided with any information or background regarding these other extensions. In any case, I am required to determine each case on its own merits in the light of current planning policy. I have done so in this case.
10. The appellant contends that the appeal dwelling is of little merit. In my view the row of three dwellings has a sense of local distinctiveness. They are small period dwellings which visibly retain their traditional form and design and as such are attractive houses.

Other Matters

11. I am aware that the appellant refers to the new extension as sustainable. Paragraph 14 of the *National Planning Policy Framework* (the Framework) states that at the heart of the Framework is a presumption in favour of sustainable development. There are three dimensions to sustainable development as defined by the Framework: economic, social and environmental. In terms of economic and social dimensions, the appellant has not adequately demonstrated how the proposed would meet these dimensions. I note that local builders would likely be employed to construct the extension so providing a local economic benefit albeit for a short duration. I also note that reliance on the car to get to access essential services and facilities would most likely remain the same. However, The Framework states that new

development should always seek to secure high quality design and that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, is indivisible from good planning, and should contribute positively to making places better for people. On the basis that I consider the proposed development would fail to respect the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the locality, I consider that it would not meet the requirements of the environmental dimension. This is the determining factor in this case. This would be contrary to Policy DM12 of the *Newark and Sherwood Local Development Framework Allocations & Development Management Development Plan Document* adopted in 2013 (DPD), which requires that development that improves the economic, social and environmental conditions within the district should be approved.

12. The appellants state that the proposed development is necessary to accommodate an elderly relative. Personal circumstances rarely outweigh more general planning considerations such as impact on the locality. In this case the proposed development would remain long after the personal circumstances cease to be relevant. Therefore, the personal needs of the family do not outweigh the harmful effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the locality

Conclusions

13. Therefore, I find that the proposed extension would result in a large and prominent addition, which would fail to respect the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the local distinctiveness of the area. This is contrary to Spatial Policy 3 and Core Policy 9 of the *Newark and Sherwood Local Development Framework Core Strategy Development Plan Document* (adopted 2011). It would also conflict with DPD Policies DM5 and DM6, which require that new developments should respect the design and character of both the host dwelling and the character of the local area including its local distinctiveness and the open character of the countryside.
14. It would conflict with guidance entitled *Householder Development Supplementary Planning Document* (SPD) (adopted in 2014), which states amongst other things that the overall objective for any proposed additions should be based around its successful integration with the host dwelling and its surrounding area. This is achieved by ensuring the extension respects and is balanced in scale and proportions with the host dwelling and the application site. It would also be contrary to The Framework.
15. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

A L Fairclough

INSPECTOR