



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 November 2020 by Andreea Spataru BA (Hons) MA

Decision by Zoe Raygen Dip URP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 January 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/Q3060/D/20/3259276

5 Caxmere Drive, Nottingham NG8 1GG

- 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 Simon Browning against the decision of Nottingham City Council.
 - The application Ref 20/00685/PFUL3 (PP-08616248), dated 27 March 2020, was refused by notice dated 23 June 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as "removal the existing roof structure and new loft accommodation with raised roof".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal relates to a detached, two-storey dwelling located on the southern side of Caxmere Drive, within a residential area. Neighbouring properties located on the same roadside are similar in scale and design with the appeal dwelling and those on the opposite side are bungalows of smaller scale. Whilst the dwellings on the southern side are slightly staggered in relation to each other, there is consistency in terms of roofs height and pitch, which contributes positively to the rhythm of the properties and thus to the relatively uniform character and appearance of the street scene in this respect.
 5. The proposal seeks to increase the height of the roof and to alter its pitch to facilitate the conversion of the loft to habitable accommodation. The proposal also includes a dormer to the rear.
 6. The proposed alterations to the roof would increase the prominence of the dwelling, making it appear overly dominant and incongruous within the street scene. The increased roof height coupled with the change in the roof pitch would harmfully disrupt the existing rhythm of the properties located on the
-

southern side of Caxmere Drive. Its visual prominence would be particularly accentuated in the context of the street scene, when considering the scale of the bungalows located on the opposite side of the road. I note that the eaves height would be maintained, and the materials would match the existing; however, these elements would not be sufficient to mitigate the detrimental impact of the roof alterations. Accordingly, the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of both the existing dwelling and the surrounding area.

7. The appellants have drawn my attention to a similar roof extension at No 68 Lambourne Drive, with the exception of the front dormer which is not part of the proposal before me. However, I do not have all the details of this case, or the circumstances in which it was granted permission before me. I cannot therefore be certain that they are directly comparable. Moreover, I have considered the proposal on the basis of the site-specific circumstances of this case and I note that the street scene of No 68 Lambourne Drive differs from that of the appeal property, as the properties located opposite No 68 are also two-storey dwellings.
8. The appellants argue that a more harmful scheme could be carried out as 'permitted development' subject to a successful prior approval application. I have though nothing before me to substantiate this. Regardless, this is not for me to determine in the context of a S78 appeal. I have therefore determined the appeal as submitted.
9. Accordingly, I conclude that the proposal would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene. Therefore, the development would be contrary to Policy 10 of the Aligned Core Strategies Part 1 Local Plan adopted 2014 and Policy DE1 of the Land and Planning Policies Development Plan Document Local Plan Part 2 adopted 2020, which collectively require, amongst other things, that developments respect and enhance the streetscape and character of the area, and in particular its established scale, massing, rhythm and landscape (including ridge lines).

Recommendation

10. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

Andreea Spataru

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

11. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Zoe Raygen

INSPECTOR