



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 December 2019 by Darren Ellis MPlan

Decision by Susan Ashworth BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21st January 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/A3010/D/19/3237849

12 Moor Top Road, Harworth, DN11 8PL

- 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 Andrew Hewerdine against the decision of Bassetlaw District Council.
 - The application Ref 19/00882/HSE, dated 1 July 2019, was refused by notice dated 27 August 2019.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a two-storey side extension and detached garage to dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to the two-storey side extension.
2. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to the detached garage subject to the conditions below:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Site Plan 1:500 revision B, Proposed Elevations revision C, and Proposed Ground Floor Plan revision A, insofar as the drawings relate to the detached garage.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the garage hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing house.

Appeal Procedure

3. 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

4. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal site comprises a semi-detached dormer bungalow with an existing two-storey rear extension and a detached garage to the rear. The site is located on a prominent corner plot in Moor Top Road. The proposed
-

- development would see the erection of a two-storey side extension with front dormers and a detached garage to the side of the property.
6. The site fronts onto part of the street where there are 4 pairs of dormer bungalows, each built to a similar symmetrical design, with centrally positioned adjoining dormer windows. These buildings form a rhythm and pattern in the street scene and positively contribute to the character and appearance of the area.
 7. The proposed extension would be a sizeable structure which would reflect the form and ridge height of the existing building. Nevertheless, the proposal would introduce two additional flat-roof dormers to the frontage. These dormers would add clutter to, and dominate, the roof slope, and moreover would unbalance the simple appearance and symmetry of the pair of semi-detached properties. Consequently, the proposed dormers would not be in keeping with the character and appearance of the property or this part of the street scene.
 8. My attention has been drawn to a planning permission¹ that was granted in 2018 for a single-storey side extension to a bungalow in Mount Close near to the appeal site. The property in Mount Close is in a less prominent position than the appeal property and in any event the development in that case is not of the same form as the proposal before me. Accordingly, the two cases are not directly comparable.
 9. I am also informed that a new housing estate has been approved close to the appeal site, although I have no details of this before me. Whilst I acknowledge that the appearance of the village will undoubtedly change as a result of this new development, this has no direct bearing on the immediate street scene or the context of the appeal site.
 10. For the reasons given above, I consider that the proposed side extension would cause significant harm to the appearance and character of the area and would be contrary to Policy DM4 of the Bassetlaw District Local Development Framework (LDF), Policy 1 of the Harworth and Bircotes Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP), and the Council's adopted SPD on residential design 'Successful Places', which all seek to ensure that development does not significantly and adversely affect the character and appearance of the neighbourhood in which it is located.
 11. The proposed garage would be located in a corner position and would align with the building lines on both road frontages. It would be constructed in materials to match the existing dwelling and would have a simple form. Whilst the existing boundary screening may not be a permanent feature it would soften the appearance of the development. I note that the Council has raised no objections to this element of the proposal and from all I have seen and read I conclude that the proposed garage would not cause any undue harm to the character or appearance of the area. As such this element of the proposal would comply with Policy DM4 of the LDF, Policy 1 of the NDP and the SPD.

Conditions

¹ Planning application ref. 17/01500/HSE

12. In the interests of proper planning and to provide certainty I have recommended the standard time limit condition and have specified the approved plans.
13. In the interests of the character and appearance of the appeal property and the street scene, it is necessary to attach a condition that requires the materials of the external surfaces of the garage to match the external materials of the existing property.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I therefore recommend a split decision; that the appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to the side extension and allowed insofar as it relates to the garage subject to the above conditions.

Darren Ellis

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

15. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis a split decision is issued.

S Ashworth

INSPECTOR