
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 May 2020

by T J Burnham BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1st June 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/P3040/D/20/3244802

3 Adbolton Grove, West Bridgford NG2 5AR

- 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 Thomas Allen & Dr Natalie Scroggie against the decision of Rushcliffe Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 19/02612/FUL, dated 8 November 2019, was refused by notice dated 19 December 2019.
 - The development proposed is Demolition of existing single storey garage and front single storey part of dwelling. Erection of two storey front extension and two storey side extension. Addition of balcony to rear of dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed. Planning permission is granted for the demolition of existing single storey garage and front single storey part of dwelling, erection of two storey front extension and two storey side extension including the addition of balcony to rear of dwelling at 3 Adbolton Grove, West Bridgford NG2 5AR in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 19/02612/FUL dated 8 November 2019 subject to the following conditions:
 - 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: P01, P02 & P03 REV B.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and area.

Reasons

3. The area is residential in nature. There is a significant and notable variety in the age, type, form, scale and design of residential properties within the street.
4. The proposal would see an extension of contemporary design which includes an increase in eaves height and the associated introduction of a shallower gabled roof, along with the loss of existing side dormer windows. There is no doubt that the proposals would have a transformative effect on the appearance of the dwelling and would add significant bulk given the contemporary design and because significant extension is proposed towards the front of the dwelling that would be highly visible from the street.

5. I note that SPD¹ guidance suggests that as a general rule the style and design of the original dwelling should remain the dominant element with the extension subordinate to it. However, the use of the phrase 'as a general rule' would appear to allow for circumstances where, as in this case, if appropriate, a less subordinate extension could be found acceptable.
6. The general design and form of the appeal property is not readily replicated within the street. The steeply pitched roof and significant setback are both characteristics that are not broadly representative, with other dwellings exhibiting substantial variety in their position and roof form. I am aware that a similar scheme has been approved at the site by the Council which maintains steeper roof pitches. However, the appeal property is of limited architectural merit and as a result does not make a significant contribution to the character and appearance of the area. I therefore do not see the retention of the steeper roof pitches, or the dormers, as being critical.
7. The evidence indicates that the pitches proposed to the roof would be more in keeping with those on other properties on the east side of the street. Furthermore, the impact of the additional bulk created through the forward extension would be mitigated by the presence of a two- storey forward projecting element at 3A Adbolton Grove, which the proposal would not sit forward of. The design of the proposal is sympathetic to the existing dwelling in that the existing east/west ridgeline would be replicated within the scheme. The plans indicate cedar clad screening to the sides of the rear balcony of sufficient height to protect the living conditions of adjoining occupiers.
8. I therefore consider that the proposal represents a high-quality contemporary design which would be reflective of other more contemporary features and elements evident within the area. For this reason, and those above, the proposal would comply with Policies 1 and 10 of the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy (2014) and Policy 1 of the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies (2019) which amongst other things seek development which is sympathetic to the character and appearance of the neighbouring buildings, surrounding area and townscape characteristics. It would also comply with the National Planning Policy Framework (2019) which amongst other things seeks to promote good quality design.

Conditions

9. Planning permission is granted subject to the standard three year time limit. It is necessary that the development be carried out in accordance with the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of certainty.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed subject to the conditions.

T J Burnham

INSPECTOR

¹ Rushcliffe Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2009