
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 October 2020

by A M Nilsson BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 November 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/P3040/D/20/3257598

4 Cambridge Road, West Bridgford, Nottingham, Nottinghamshire NG2 5LZ

- 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 Miss Sharon Dawson against the decision of Rushcliffe Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 20/01503/FUL, dated 19 June 2020, was refused by notice dated 7 August 2020.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey rear extension at 4 Cambridge Road, West Bridgford, Nottingham, Nottinghamshire NG2 5LZ in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 20/01503/FUL, dated 19 June 2020 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 plan; Drawing titled – Single Storey Rear Extension at 4 Cambridge Road, West Bridgford, Nottingham, NG2 5LZ, Floor Plan and Elevations as Proposed.
 - 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 main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of the occupants of 6 Cambridge Road with regard to outlook.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two-storey semi-detached property with roof level accommodation. It is located in a residential street of predominantly two storey houses, many of which have been extended and altered.
4. The property appears to have been extended previously in the form of an existing single storey rear extension. The existing and proposed extensions would run along the common boundary with 6 Cambridge Road where there is a boundary fence of around 1.8m in height. When viewed from 6 Cambridge

Road, the proposed extension would be visible above the existing fence, however most of it would be screened. The proposed flat roof would mean that less than 1m of the extension would be visible above the existing boundary treatment when viewed from 6 Cambridge Road. Although there is a lantern that increases the overall height of the extension, this is sited centrally and combined with the use of translucent material I do not consider that this element would create harm.

5. Despite the presence of an existing single storey rear extension to 6 Cambridge Road that spans approximately half of the rear of the property, I find that given the relatively small amount of the proposed extension that would be visible, there would not be an overly dominant effect or the creation of an unreasonable sense of enclosure or an unreasonable loss of outlook for the occupiers of that property.
6. The proposed extension would therefore not have an unreasonable impact on the living conditions of the occupiers of 6 Cambridge Road with regard to outlook. Accordingly, it would comply with Policy 10 of the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy and Policy 1 of the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies. Collectively, these policies require, amongst other things, that development should not be overbearing in relation to neighbouring properties, protecting the amenity of occupiers or nearby residents.

Conditions

7. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have imposed a condition requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of certainty. In the interests of the character and appearance of the area and the host property, it is necessary to impose a planning condition requiring the use of matching materials.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given above, and having had regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

A M Nilsson

INSPECTOR