



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 June 2019

by J Hunter BA (Hons) Msc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12th July 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/B3030/W/19/3226677

9, The Paddocks, Newark on Trent, NG24 1SS

- 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 M Moulds against the decision of Newark & Sherwood District Council.
 - The application Ref 18/01402/FUL, dated 22 July 2018, was refused by notice dated 7 November 2018.
 - The development proposed is Annex to 9 The Paddocks.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The description of development in the heading above has been taken from the planning application form. However, Part E of the appeal form states that the description of development has changed to "Part conversion of 9 The Paddocks to create an additional Chalet Bungalow". Written confirmation has been provided confirming that the main parties have agreed to the change and I have determined the appeal on that basis.
3. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was revised in February 2019. I have taken the Framework into account as part of the determination of this appeal.
4. On 7 March 2019 Newark and Sherwood District Council adopted the Amended Core Strategy 2019 as a Development Plan Document (DPD). The main parties have provided comments on the amended policy and I have taken account of the amended policy in the determination of this appeal.
5. The site visit procedure was altered from an access required site visit to an unaccompanied site visit because the appellant was not present when I arrived at the appeal site during the pre-arranged period. I was able to see all I needed to from public land.

Main Issue

6. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

7. The appeal property is located in an attractive suburban street characterised by detached and semi-detached dwellings from the post-war period. The area has discernible building lines with properties set back from the road behind open front gardens. The palette of materials used is limited but consistent throughout all the property styles and the result is a spacious, uniform feel.
8. The appeal property is a chalet style bungalow within a large corner plot. The appeal scheme is to remove an existing garage and car port and replace it with a 1.5 storey side extension. On the opposite elevation, the scheme proposes a large dormer window running the full length of the roof. The proposed extensions will facilitate the subdivision of the property into two separate residential units.
9. The proposed extension has been designed to take advantage of the dual aspect plot, introducing a curved corner elevation that would effectively round off the existing building line by mimicking the curve of the road.
10. The scale and bulk of the extension would completely alter the proportions of the original building and would appear incongruous and unbalanced. The proposed dormer window, occupying the full depth of the opposite elevation, would appear heavy and intrusive and would not complement the simple form and style of the host property or harmonise with the street scene.
11. Whilst I accept that the proposed extensions do not project forward of the established building line to any great extent this does not alter the harm that I have identified with regards to the host property and the wider street scene. I have had regard to the appeal decision relating to 8 Paddock Close, Edwinstowe (Ref: APP/B3030/D/18/3202392), and whilst I recognise that novel designs can be appropriate in some circumstances, as the appellant acknowledges, the context of that site is different from this. Moreover, I do not have any details of that scheme, and so afford it little weight in my decision.
12. I therefore find conflict with the provisions of adopted Core Policy 9 of the amended Core Strategy DPD and Policy DM5 of the Allocations and Development Management DPD 2013 as well as section 12 of the Framework.

Conclusion

13. For the reason given above and having regard to all other matters I conclude the appeal should be dismissed.

J. Hunter

INSPECTOR