
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 March 2020

by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 March 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/B3030/D/20/3245713
10 Manor Close, Bleasby NG14 7GE

- 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 Wilson and Mrs Ramsey against the decision of Newark & Sherwood District Council.
 - The application Ref 19/01666/FUL, dated 10 September 2019, was refused by notice dated 7 November 2019.
 - The development proposed is ground floor side extensions.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to the proposed side extension to the southwest elevation that would project towards Manor Close. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to the proposed side extension to the northeast elevation and planning permission is therefore granted for the erection of a ground floor side extension to the northeast elevation at 10 Manor Close, Bleasby NG14 7GE in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 19/01666/FUL, dated 10 September 2019, so far as relevant to that part of the development hereby permitted and subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) Development shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans so far as they are relevant to the development hereby permitted: 431_2019_05; 431_2019_03 and 431_2019_04.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises a detached roughly rectangular bungalow which forms a horseshoe shape of dwellings facing inwards to a small cul de sac section of Manor Close. This results in the bungalow being side elevation onto another section of Manor Close. The side elevation is roughly in line with the front elevations of other similar bungalows that face this section of Manor Close. The distinct uniformity of the degree of set back each dwelling on this section has from the road contributes to a spacious estate of single storey dwellings, sat in generous plots with landscaped front gardens. The point at

which the south west gable elevation of the appeal building terminates relative to this street scene reinforces the sense of spaciousness.

4. Adding a side extension of a not insignificant size to the south west elevation would interrupt the designed presentation of built form to this part of Manor Close. One could legitimately argue No 10 also presents to a separate part of Manor Close which has slightly more informality about it in terms of the type, configuration and size of buildings and thus, in this context, the two extensions would probably be acceptable. However, the appeal building is also read in the context of the section I have described above and in terms of an appropriate design, it would not sit well. Breaking what is something of a uniform building line on this part of Manor Close would, for this reason, appear awkward and incongruous. There is some substantial hedging bounding the garden to No 10 adjacent the highway edge but it doesn't cover every boundary and given the height and projection of the proposed extension to this elevation it would be clearly discernible in views from both road approaches.
5. For these reasons, the proposed side extension to the south west elevation would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area, contrary to Core Policy 9 of the Core Strategy¹, Policies DM5 and DM6 of the Local Plan² and the advice set out in the Council's Householder Development SPD³. Between them and amongst other things these policies and guidance seek to ensure that new development, extensions to dwellings specifically, are of a high standard and contextually appropriate design and appearance, reflecting the character of the surrounding area and distinctiveness of the district's built form.
6. In the case of the proposed side extension to the northeast elevation, this would be considerably less obvious in the public realm. It would extend the dwelling towards its nearest neighbour at No 9 which is a larger two storey property and be noticeably subservient to both it and the existing dwelling. It would also replace an existing flat roof, resulting in a roof form more befitting of the existing bungalow. This element of the proposed development would therefore not give rise to harm to the character and appearance of the area and accordingly comply with the aforementioned policies, the objectives of which I have set out.

Other Matters

7. The appellant has drawn my attention to a number of other examples of development in both the same settlement as the appeal site and elsewhere in the district. Some are substantial in size. That is not to say however that the extension to which I have objected should be acceptable. I have not been party to the circumstances of the cases cited and each proposal is considered on its own merits, with regard to its own individual context which may differ in most cases. I have explained that context above and for the reasons I have set out the proposed extension to the southwest elevation would not be acceptable.

¹ Newark and Sherwood Local Development Framework Amended Core Strategy 2019

² Newark and Sherwood Local Development Framework Allocations and Development Management Development Plan Document 2013

³ Newark and Sherwood Local Development Framework Householder Development Supplementary Planning Document 2014

8. There are areas in which the appeal scheme would, as a whole, be acceptable. Such as, for example, the proposed use of materials. Be this as it may, such a thing would amount to a lack of harm which, by definition, cannot be used to weigh against it. My conclusion is therefore unchanged.
9. The appellant mentions other dwellings that have altered roof tiles and at least one features exterior timber cladding which has, in their view, resulted in incongruous features. They may indeed be so, but such matters have occurred out of my control and, whilst again I have not been presented with the exact circumstances of each case, perhaps that of the planning system. Either way, the use of contrasting materials can create variation and add to the visual qualities of an area but would not extend to affecting the size or location of the buildings within it. Which are the main issues for the appeal scheme as I have explained.

Conditions

10. I have imposed the usual time condition as well setting out the approved plans for clarity and certainty. Explicitly referring to the development permitted only. I note the plans show an off white rendered finish to the permitted extension. The plans are referred to in condition 2. It also seems sufficiently clear from the plans that the existing dwelling would also be rendered. In any case, it does not strike me that rendering the approved extension and leaving the existing dwelling in bare brick would necessarily give rise to harm given its size and location. I am therefore content for the detail on the approved plans and covered by condition 2 to be sufficient to ensure there would be an appropriate external finish for the permitted extension.

Conclusion

11. I acknowledge the limited objection to the appeal scheme from third parties as well as some support. However, and for the reasons I have set out, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed insofar as it relates to the side extension to the northeast elevation but dismissed insofar as it relates to the side extension to the southwest elevation.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR