

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: 21 June 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/X3025/D/17/3172510

12A Wysall Close, Mansfield, Nottinghamshire NG19 6EA

- 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 Morrell against the decision of Mansfield District Council.
 - The application Ref: 2016/0638/ST, dated 7 November 2016, was refused by notice dated 18 January 2017.
 - The development proposed is described as "side extension to garage and first floor extension over extended garage".
-

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 street scene.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal dwelling, No. 12A, is a semi-detached house with an attached garage. It is located in an area of similar dwellings. These semi-detached dwellings have steeply pitched main roofs with flat roofed dormers, which have the appearance of an inserted dormer window feature in that they are set down from the ridge and set in from the side gable and set up from the eaves.
 4. The appeal dwelling and the attached dwelling are slightly different to the other dwellings on Wysall Close in that they have pitched dormer roofs set into their steeply pitched main roof. Plus they have a staggered frontage such that No. 12A, is set slightly back from the front building line of No.12B, the attached dwelling. Although both Nos 12A and 12B are set significantly back from the road, No 12A is immediately adjacent to a public footpath, which links Wysall Close to Westfield Drive.
 5. The proposed ground floor side extension would be flush with the front elevation of the existing garage but would be set slightly in at the rear. The existing steeply pitched roof above the garage would be extended sideways. Although the form and design of the ground floor side extension would reflect the character and appearance of the adjacent garage and the host dwelling, the front elevation of the side extension would be clad in brown upvc. This is
-

an alien material and would not reflect or match the existing mixed brindle brickwork of the host dwelling. This would appear out of place on the dwelling.

6. The first floor addition to the garage roof would include front and rear dormer windows, which would straddle the existing ridge of the garage roof with a shallower pitched roof than the existing roof. This would create a bulky extension with a higher ridge, albeit it would be lower than the main roof of the host dwelling. The use of brown upvc cladding at ground floor level and the design, bulk and form of the first floor extension when combined with the higher ridge would create an addition that would fail to harmonise or complement the existing character and appearance of the host dwelling.
7. Furthermore, the proposed dormer would have a wide expanse of dormer cheek, which would be clad in white upvc. The discordant nature of the first floor extension would be emphasised by this comparatively large expanse of lightly coloured modern material, which would be highly visible on the front elevation and from the adjacent footpath and would dominate the dwelling at high level. Although the appeal dwelling and its attached neighbour have used upvc cladding on the existing dormers, this material covers a relatively small proportion of the existing dormers when compared to the appeal scheme. Also, this material is generally atypical in the area as most of the other dormer windows within the street are clad in darker tiles. Thus the proposed first floor addition would appear prominent and incongruous in the street scene.

Other Matters

8. I note the appellants state that the proposed development is necessary for their needs as a family. I also acknowledge that the overall design is required to link the proposed rear dormer into the existing rear dormer. However, the personal needs of the family and the need to link the extension to a rear dormer do not outweigh the harmful effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene. I note that the appellants' have voiced their dissatisfaction in the way the Council Officer dealt with the planning application. However this is not something that I am able to comment on as part of a planning appeal.

Conclusions

9. The proposed development would create a discordant and dominant side/first floor extension to the existing dwelling. Moreover it would appear prominent and incongruous when viewed from Wysall Close and from the public footpath above the fence such that it would detrimentally affect the character and appearance of the street scene. It would conflict with saved Policy BE1 of the *Mansfield District Local Plan* (adopted 1998), which states, among other things, that developments should relate well to neighbouring buildings and the local area in terms of scale, massing and height and states that the material used should be in keeping with the sites surroundings. This policy reflects the *National Planning Policy Framework* (The Framework). Therefore, I accord it significant weight.
10. It would also conflict with the Council's supplementary planning guidance entitled *Interim Planning Guidance Note 2: Extensions to Dwellings*, which seeks to restrict dormers to inserts in roofs and that dormers should not dominate.

11. Furthermore, it would be contrary to The Framework which 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. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

A L Fairclough

INSPECTOR