The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 January 2020

by Paul Cooper MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4 February 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/J3015/D/19/3237695
53 Enfield Street, Beeston, Nottingham NG9 1DL

- 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 Mrs Parveen Kusar against the decision of Broxtowe Borough Council.
- The application Ref 19/00131/FUL, dated 25 February 2019, was refused by notice dated 3 September 2019.
- The development proposed is retain the single storey and two storey rear extension and rear dormer.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Application for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Mrs Parveen Kusar against Broxtowe Borough Council. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Main Issues

3. The main issue in this case is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. According to the evidence in front of me, planning consent was granted for a single and two storey rear extension. However, a hip-to-gable extension and a rear dormer were also constructed, and the proposed hipped roof to the two storey extension was built with a shallow lean-to roof in order to accommodate the rear dormer. A new application was submitted to regularise the completed works, and following refusal of planning consent, is the subject of this appeal.

5. Since the application was refused, the Broxtowe Borough Council Part 2 Local Plan (the LP) was adopted in October 2019. As a result, Policy H9 referred to on the Council's Decision Notice has been superseded and replaced by Policy 17.

6. Policy 17 of the LP states that, amongst other matters, householder development should be of a size, siting and design that makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area and does not dominate the existing building or appear over prominent in the street scene, and also that dormers should not dominate the roof.

7. From my site visit, it is apparent that the amendments to the original planning consent have resulted in a configuration of the property that creates a visually jarring aspect when viewed from key vantage points around the vicinity of the site. The removal of the hipped roof to the two storey extension to facilitate the dormer has resulted in a bulky structure, with little refinement offered by the use of a suitably designed roof structure. This is visible from properties to the rear and vantage points on Hope Street and is harmful to the character and appearance of the area.

8. The bulk of the extension is then compounded by the installation of the rear dormer, which covers almost the whole of the rear roof slope, with a box structure that does not respect the traditional design of the original dwelling, creating a structure that has the outward appearance of dominating the surrounding area, and does not respect the character and appearance of the area.

9. The hip to gable extension to the side appears visually jarring when seen in the context of the host dwelling and surrounding properties, and this harm is increased by the use of inappropriate materials that are visually substandard and injurious to the context of the street scene. The combination of this section and the rear dormer creates a structure that does not respect the proportions of the host dwelling and again, does not respect the character and appearance of the area.

10. As a result, I find that the appeal proposals are in clear conflict with Policy 17 of the LP and Policy 10 of the Aligned Core Strategy (2014) which states that development will be assessed in its treatment of a number of elements, including massing, scale, proportion, materials, architectural style and detailing.

Other Matters

11. I have noted the comments of the appellant in respect of the status of the roof for the extension and the rear dormer, but I agree with the interpretation of the Council that the whole development constituted a single operation and as such, planning permission was required for the installation of the dormer. I have set out in my reasoning above why the flat roof element is inappropriate. Therefore, I can only attach minimal weight to those arguments, and have determined the appeal in accordance with the submission.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons outlined above and having had regard to all of the other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Paul Cooper

INSPECTOR