



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 October 2017

by S Jones MA DipLP

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

Decision date: 9th November 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/N1025/D/17/3179225
245 Breedon Street, Long Eaton NG10 4EX

- 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 Romaine Graham against the decision of Erewash Borough Council.
 - The application Ref ERE/0417/0029, dated 15 March 2017, was refused by notice dated 14 June 2017.
 - The development proposed is two storey side extension single storey rear extension new windows to front and side.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the appeal property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a semi-detached dwelling on a corner triangular plot facing diagonally towards No 284 Breedon Street opposite it at the crossroads of Breedon Street and Ravensdale Avenue. Surrounding dwellings are a mixture of similar semi-detached, detached houses and a bungalow directly opposite, and terraces farther along Breedon Street.
4. The property has two existing extensions- a two storey part side extension and a single storey rear conservatory. The plan showing the existing elevations (ref 030140 a single reference used for all the plans) is incorrect in so far as it does not mark the existing conservatory or the existing relocation of one of the rear doors. To the rear, the conservatory would be replaced with a brickbuilt extension with two skylights in a shallow pitched roof and folding patio doors. To the side the development would infill the rest of the side elevation to come level with the existing frontage underneath a new section of hipped roof lower than the existing ridgeline, inserting five new openings. It would project out further to the side than the existing part side extension according to the plans ref 030140, to allow for a side staircase and a straight corridor upstairs.
5. Roughly speaking the combination of existing and proposed extensions would at least double the footprint of the original building. This would be very much larger and out of size and scale with adjoining dwelling of this semi-detached

pair and those alongside. The resulting building would have a variety of single and double storey roof designs, varying window treatments and an uneven outline which would be out of keeping with the majority of surrounding buildings. The wider two storey frontage and greater side depth of the proposed development would appear dominant on the corner in the streetscene, particularly with the low level bungalow directly opposite. Due to the size and scale, design, and dominance of the proposed development it would be harmful to the character and appearance of the appeal property and the surrounding area.

6. I appreciate the appellant's comments that the existing hedge and tree would screen the side development from public views. I agree the rear extension would not be visible. However I find the two storey side extension and roof variations would be visible above the lower hedge and trees so that, overall, the alterations to the building would be particularly prominent in the streetscene.
7. I have taken account of the mixed styles of housing and other extensions in the area referred to by the appellant, the dwelling at the corner of Byron Avenue being stated to be similar to this proposal. However, I note that the Byron Avenue property is a different configuration to this one, so that it is not directly comparable. Moreover, I do not have full details of other extensions completed in the area, or their dates of construction, and each appeal must be determined on its own merits according to the particular location and the policy criteria applicable at the time.
8. As set out above, this particular design at this particular location would be harmful to the character and appearance of the appeal property and the surrounding area and there are no other considerations that would outweigh the harm arising. I conclude it would therefore be contrary to saved Policy DC2 of the Erewash Local Plan and Policy 10 of the Erewash Borough Council Core Strategy 2011-2028 and the National Planning Policy Framework which together seek to secure high quality design which reflects its surroundings.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

S Jones

INSPECTOR