



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 July 2020

by K Savage BA MPlan MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 July 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/J3015/D/20/3250623

49 Attewell Road, Awwsworth NG16 2SY

- 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 & Mrs Nichols against the decision of Broxtowe Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 19/00743/FUL, dated 19 November 2019, was refused by notice dated 15 January 2020.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side extension and single storey rear extension to existing dwelling. Trimming of overhanging trees back to boundary line.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two storey side extension and single storey rear extension to existing dwelling and trimming of overhanging trees back to boundary line, at 49 Attewell Road, Awwsworth NG16 2SY, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 19/00743/FUL, dated 19 November 2019, and subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Site Location Plan; Block Plan; 1930/01 (Existing Floor Plans); 1930/02 (Existing Elevations); 1930/10 (Proposed Floor Plans); 1930/11 (Proposed Elevations).
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site forms part of a group of three dwellings at the end of a cul-de-sac. They are consistent in size and general design, albeit with some differences to the external finishes on the front elevations and in the size of the porches. The dwellings have a stepped roofline reflecting the sloping topography. The group is separated from the other dwellings along Attewell Road by the turning head of the cul-de-sac, but I saw the street generally consisted of semi-detached pairs, some also exhibiting a stepped roofline but others on flatter terrain having aligned roofs, with side extensions of different sizes to some properties.

4. The proposed side extension would extend the massing of No 49 across at the same scale, without any step in the roofline or other element of subordination as is considered necessary by the Council, and as was approved in 2019 under planning permission Ref 19/00499/FUL.
5. As proposed, the consistent roof pattern of the three dwellings would not be maintained, but the characteristic step between each dwelling and overall appearance of the group as comprising three dwellings would be retained. Whilst the roof would not be set down nor the elevations set in relative to the existing dwelling, the extension would be narrower in width and absent a porch at the front which would lend it an element of subservience and allow it to be discerned from the existing dwelling. The extension would also stand at the low end of the group which would temper the visual impact of its massing and its position would not result in a terracing effect. Accordingly, I find that the extension would not be unduly dominant, nor would it result in No 49 being excessive in scale relative to the group as a whole. In this respect, I draw on my observations of No 37 which has been similarly extended without subordination, but which did not appear to me either dominant in scale relative to the existing dwelling, nor did the resulting massing of the semi-detached pair appear dominant relative to surrounding development.
6. I recognise that the stepped arrangement is a noticeable feature of the group and elsewhere along Attewell Road, and I can understand the Council's desire to continue the pattern. However, whilst this would enable the extension to be discerned from the main dwelling, the extension would not match the width of the dwellings so as to maintain the regularity of the pattern, but would appear somewhat diminutive next to the broader massing of the three dwellings. Ultimately, neither the appeal scheme nor the approved scheme would faithfully maintain the stepped roof pattern, but I find that the proposal would sufficiently maintain the characteristic features of the group and would not be disproportionate in scale or appear dominant in the street scene.
7. The Council raised no objection to the proposed single storey rear extension in view of its small scale and location out of view from the public realm. Having seen its location for myself, I have no reason to reach a different view.
8. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the area, and so would not conflict with Policy 10 of the Aligned Core Strategies Part 1 Local Plan (September 2014)¹ or Policy 17 of the Broxtowe Part 2 Local Plan (October 2019) which together require development to, amongst other things, reinforce valued local characteristics, integrate into its surroundings and to 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.

Other Matters

9. The proposal was not refused on the basis of harm to the living conditions of neighbouring occupants, and on the evidence before me and my observations on site of the proposed size and positions of the extensions, I have no reason to conclude otherwise.

¹ Adopted by Broxtowe Borough Council, Gedling Borough Council and Nottingham City Council

10. I have had regard to other matters raised by the appellant, including whether the approved scheme would provide sufficient ceiling heights, but given my findings on the main issue, such matters would not be determinative and it is not necessary for me to address them further. Concerns relating to the Council's handling of the application are not relevant to my determination of the appeal, which I have considered on its planning merits.

Conditions

11. To provide certainty, a condition is required specifying the relevant drawings. It is also necessary to impose a condition requiring external surface materials to match the existing dwelling in order to secure a satisfactory appearance.

Conclusion

12. For these reasons, the appeal is allowed.

K. Savage

INSPECTOR