



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 January 2020 by Andreea Spataru BA (Hons) MA

Decision by Susan Ashworth BA (Hons) BPL MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3rd February 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/B3030/D/19/3239353

**Poachers Cottage, 2 Barrel Hill Road, Sutton On Trent, Nottinghamshire
NG23 6PR**

- 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 Brown against the decision of Newark and Sherwood District Council.
 - The application Ref 19/01139/FUL, dated 10 June 2019, was refused by notice dated 19 August 2019.
 - The development proposed is a two storey front extension.
-

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 area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal relates to a detached, two-storey dwelling located in a prominent position within the countryside, next to open fields. The property is of modest appearance with a simple pitched roof and a flat roofed extension at the rear. The dwelling, like its neighbour No 1 Barrel Hill Road, is set back from the road and has an open area of garden to the front. That open space is a feature that makes a significant contribution to the open character and appearance of the wider rural area.
 5. The proposed two-storey front extension would project along the full width of the host dwelling and would increase the depth of the dwelling by utilising the space at the front of the property. The extension would have a double pitched roof with two gabled elements facing the road. It would be a similar height to the host dwelling.
 6. The proposal would entirely obscure the front elevation of the existing property. Moreover, due to its depth, height and overall mass, the extension would result
-

in a bulky addition to the front the house, which would appear out of proportion with the existing dwelling. Whilst the bulk of the roof would be reduced to some degree by the use of a double pitched roof, this would not be sufficient to make the extension appear proportionate or subservient to the host dwelling. Moreover, it seems to me, the form of the roof as proposed would not be in keeping with the simple form of the existing property. The use of matching materials, whilst appropriate in itself, would not mitigate the harm I have identified.

7. In addition, the increased massing would make the dwelling considerably more substantial and thereby more dominant, particularly when viewed from the road and open fields. Furthermore, the open space to the front of dwelling would be significantly reduced due to the forward projection of the extension. I recognise that the character of the group of three properties differs from that of the surrounding rural landscape. Nevertheless, the increase in the volume and massing of the proposal would have an effect on openness in both visual and spatial terms and would therefore have an, albeit limited, adverse effect on the appearance of the area.
8. I acknowledge that, because the site is limited in terms of its size, there is limited alternative space in which to extend the building. I also acknowledge that the existing rear extension has had a significant impact on the character and appearance of the original dwelling. However, these matters do not justify the detrimental impact that the two-storey front extension would have on the property or wider area.
9. I have noted that neighbouring properties vary in terms of their design and scale and that some of them have large, prominent extensions, such as that of the adjoining property No. 1 Barrel Hill Road. However, I do not find the proposal directly comparable to these extensions, particularly because of its siting in relation to the host dwelling and the streetscene.
10. Accordingly, I conclude that through a combination of large size, scale, and siting, the proposal would result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and of the area. Therefore, the development would be contrary to Core Policy 9 of the Newark and Sherwood Amended Core Strategy and Policies DM5 and DM6 of the Newark and Sherwood Allocations & Development Management Development Plan Document, which collectively require, amongst other things, for development to be of an appropriate form and scale to its context, complementing the existing built and landscape environments.

Recommendation

11. 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

12. 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