



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 March 2020

by Andrew McGlone BSc MCD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 March 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/B3030/D/19/3243929

34 Eakring Road, Bilsthorpe NG22 8PY

- 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 and Mrs Dennis Comerford against the decision of Newark & Sherwood District Council.
 - The application Ref 19/01515/FUL, dated 14 August 2019, was refused by notice dated 30 October 2019.
 - The development proposed is a single storey front and side elevation extension, canopy to entrance door and retrospective application for a bay window.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of development refers to retrospective planning permission being sought for a bay window to the front of the dwelling. However, the bay window shown on the submitted plans differs from the bay window that I observed during my site visit. As such, my findings solely relate to the bay window detailed on the proposed plans. Furthermore, the submitted plans include a timber pergola to the side of the dwelling. This is not expressly referred to in the description of development set out above, but as the Council considered it in refusing planning permission, I have done so also.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling sited on the corner of Eakring Road and Church Street. The semi-detached pairing is set back from the roads and benefit from open front gardens. The properties have a staggered front building line, which is broadly replicated on each of the dwellings. Notably, the pair of dwellings are orientated to face the junction which results in a sense of openness and spaciousness. The appeal property has been extended to the front and rear, while a detached garage is to the side and rear of the house. Vehicular access is taken from Church Street. Residential properties in the surrounding area are generally two storey semi-detached or terraced and positioned to either front roads or be located close to them, but there is some variety in their style.

5. The proposed development would extend the property to the front and side and change the existing staggered front building line. Policy DM6 of the Newark and Sherwood Local Development Framework Allocations and Development Management Development Plan Document (DPD) states that planning permission will be granted for the alteration and extension of dwellings provided that the proposal respects the design, materials and detailing of the host dwelling, and; respects the character of the surrounding area including its local distinctiveness. DPD Policy DM5 outlines that, among other things, the character of the built form should be reflected in the scale, form, layout and design of proposals for new development. Core Policy 9 of the Amended Core Strategy (CS) reflects these objectives insofar as form and scale so that development complements the existing built environment.
6. The proposed front and side extension would be subordinate to the host dwelling in terms of its height. The hipped roof proposed would tie in with the host dwelling's roof form. Nevertheless, the overall scale and form of the proposed extension would unbalance the host property and the semi-detached pairing. The effect of this would be particularly evident from the junction of Eakring Road and Church Street. The proposed front and side extension would also eek away at the spacious context that characterises the semi-detached pairing. Hence, the proposal would not successfully integrate with the host dwelling and its surrounding area as it would not achieve a balanced visual relationship as sought by the Council's Householder Development Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).
7. Properties in the surrounding area have been altered and extended. While the schemes at 10 Church Street and 38 Eakring Road may have been determined by the Council against the same development plan policies and guidance, they relate to a different form of development and on properties set within a linear pattern of development. Neither example has the same spacious open character as the appeal site. As such, they do not lend weight to the appeal scheme. I also saw the extension at 20 Church Street. While this property has a broadly similar physical relationship to the road junction as the appeal site, the presence of several trees in front of the dwelling mean that No 20 does not have the same open character. Added to this, I do not know the full circumstances which led the Council to grant planning permission for this extension. Hence, the example at No 20 carries little weight.
8. The pergola would taper inwards. Consequently, it and the proposed entrance canopy have the potential to integrate with the host dwelling and respect the character of the surrounding area. Furthermore, the proposed bay window would be a modest addition to the property and the proposed roof form would respond to the host property. Even so, the bay window would not be physically separate from the proposed front and side extension. Nor does the acceptability of the other aspects of the appeal scheme outweigh the significant harm that would be caused by the scale and form of the proposed front and side extension.
9. Efforts have been made by the appellants to design the appeal scheme to respond to the site's specific circumstances and to overcome the Council's concerns. This has resulted in amendments being made following discussions with the Council. I note the informal alternative suggested by the Council and the appellants view that this would be of little benefit and not cost effective. However, these matters do not alter or outweigh my findings on this issue

which centre on the proposals effect on the character and appearance of the area. Nor does the lack of any objection from residents or consultees mean that the scheme is acceptable in planning terms. There is also no requirement for appellants to submit a pre-application enquiry, even though it is encouraged and often beneficial.

10. Accordingly, I conclude that the proposed development would result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the area. The proposal would conflict with CS Core Policy 9, DPD Policies DM5 and DM6 and the SPD; which collectively seek alterations and extensions to dwellings to, among other things, successfully integrate with the host dwelling and respect the character of the surrounding area by achieving a balanced visual relationship having regard to the scale, form and design of proposals.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal is dismissed.

Andrew McGlone

INSPECTOR