



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 July 2019 by Andreea Spataru BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

Decision by Susan Ashworth BA (Hons) BPL MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 July 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/J3015/D/19/3228940

37 Humber Road, Beeston, Nottingham NG9 2EJ

- 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 & Mrs B Morrell against the decision of Broxtowe Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 19/00088/FUL, dated 7 February 2019, was refused by notice dated 15 April 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as "two storey side extension, single storey front and rear extensions".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and of the streetscene.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site comprises 37 Humber Road, a semi-detached, two-storey dwelling with a detached garage to side. The dwelling has a rendered finish, hipped roof and red tiles. The garage matches the render finish of the host property but appears to be in a poor condition. The site is situated within a predominantly residential area characterised by a mix of terraced, semi-detached and detached properties. There are also several businesses within proximity of the site. The neighbouring properties vary in terms of scale, design, materials and finishes although the pair of semi-detached properties of which the appeal site forms part, and the pairs of properties located to both sides have a level of consistency in terms of roof style and proportions.
 5. The proposal would replace the existing detached garage and would incorporate a new garage to the side/front. The two-storey side extension would cover the full depth of the host dwelling and the single storey parts would project beyond the front and rear elevations of the host dwelling. The first floor of the two-storey extension would be slightly set-back from the front
-

elevation of the host property and the extension would be slightly set-down from the main ridge. The roof of the original dwelling would be changed from hipped to gable and the two-storey side extension would have a hipped roof. A lean-to-roof is proposed for the single storey extensions. The extensions would match the white render and red tiles of the host dwelling.

6. Although the initial scheme has been amended to provide a hipped roof for the two-storey side extension, and a set-back and set-down, these alterations are not sufficient to make the proposal appear subservient to the host property. With the excessive width of the side extension coupled with the forward projection of the garage and extension beyond the rear wall, the extended section of the house would appear overly large in scale and not subordinate to the original dwelling. Whilst the development would replace the existing garage, the scale of the extensions significantly exceeds that of the existing structure.
7. The development would significantly increase the footprint and volume of the existing building. The host dwelling would be dominated by the massing of the extensions. Thus, the development would not only be detrimental to the character and appearance of the host dwelling but would also appear bulky and cumbersome in its own right.
8. The increased massing would make the dwelling considerably more substantial and thereby more dominant, particularly when viewed in relation to the adjoining property no 35 Humber Road. In addition to the unbalance between the pair of semi-detached properties caused by the significant scale of the extensions, the roof symmetry of the pair would also suffer due to the change in the roof style of the original dwelling. Given the prominent position of the appeal site within the streetscene, the incongruous appearance of the development would be clearly visible. The extensions would not harmonise with the scale and proportions of the host dwelling and the proposed design would also affect the appearance of the pair of semi-detached properties. Thus, the development would be harmful to the appearance of both the existing dwelling and the streetscene.
9. The appellants have drawn my attention to several other examples of similar developments in the area, some of which I did note during the site visit. Of particular note given their proximity to the appeal site were the extensions to Nos 47 and 51 Queen's Drive. The roof of No 47 has been altered from hipped to gable and no 51 has a two-storey extension to the side. Whilst each of these properties has been extended by incorporating elements of this proposal, the overall scale and design of the proposed development is sufficiently different from those of neighbouring properties, and this limits the weight that can be given to them in my consideration of this appeal. Nevertheless, all proposals need to be considered on their own merit.
10. I acknowledge that there would be some benefits, in visual terms, to the removal of the existing garage. The proposal would make better use of the available space and would provide enhanced, and sustainable internal living conditions for the appellants. However, good design is a key aspect of sustainability. It seems to me that similar benefits could be provided by a less intrusive proposal and therefore the benefits of the proposal in this case do not outweigh the harm identified.

11. It is possible that the property could be extended without the need for planning permission. It is argued that these changes to the property could be more harmful to the streetscene than the proposal. Be that as it may, any extensions built as permitted development would be subject to certain conditions and limits in terms of scale and design. Moreover, there is nothing before me to suggest that there is an intention to construct an alternative proposal. Accordingly, I give this matter limited weight as a realistic fallback position.
12. I acknowledge that a further reduction in the width of the extensions would have resulted in insufficient room for the off-street parking of a car. However, I am unconvinced that provision of one off-street parking space cannot be made whilst keeping the development proportionate and subservient to the host property. Given the condition of the existing garage, the Council finds the proposal acceptable in terms of highways safety. I have no reason to disagree. However, these matters do not make the scheme acceptable and do not outweigh the harm I have identified.
13. While the appellants have raised concerns as to whether the Council acted in a positive and proactive way, this does not affect the proposal before me or the conclusions that I have reached. I acknowledge that the development would not affect the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties and I note that no objections have been made by third parties. However, a lack of objections from neighbours is not a determinative factor.
14. Accordingly, I conclude that through a combination of its design, large size, scale, and prominent position, the proposal would result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the streetscene. Therefore, the development would be contrary to Policy H9 of the Broxtowe Local Plan (2004), Policy 10 of the Broxtowe Aligned Core Strategy (2014), and Policy 17 of the Draft Part 2 Local Plan (2018), which require, amongst other things, for development to be in keeping with the original building and the streetscene by having regard to design, massing, scale and proportions.

Recommendation

15. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

Andreea Spataru

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

16. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

S Ashworth

INSPECTOR