



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 July 2021

by Paul Cooper MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 July 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/J3015/D/21/3273296

12 Leamington Drive, Chilwell, Nottinghamshire NG9 5LJ

- 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 Rachel Garton Wills against the decision of Broxtowe Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/00048/FUL, dated 15 January 2021, was refused by notice dated 30 March 2021.
 - The development proposed is construct 2 storey extension to front and side of dwelling and single storey extension to rear of property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the development on the existing dwelling and the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal dwelling is a detached two-storey dwelling located within a residential area. The dwelling is one of four detached properties on a spur that is located off the existing cul-de-sac.
4. The appeal proposals constitute a two-storey extension to the side of the property that comes partway across the front elevation, and projects approximately 2m forward of the existing front elevation. The rear extension is single storey in nature and projects approximately 5.3m beyond the existing rear elevation. An existing outbuilding would be removed in order to facilitate the rear extension.
5. I find that due to its scale and forward projection, the extension would appear dominant and incongruous in the context of both the host property and the street scene. Whilst there have been alterations to properties in the area, I consider that such a departure from the established built form would be both inconsistent and unsightly.
6. Due to its design, scale and siting, it would unbalance the host property, appearing uncharacteristic and cause material harm to the character and appearance of the area.
7. In addition, the proximity of the side extension to the adjacent property (No 14) would appear overbearing to that property and create a cramped, oppressive environment on the access to the side of that property.

8. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would have an unacceptable impact on the character and appearance of the area and would be contrary to Policy 17 of the Broxtowe Borough Council Part 2 Local Plan (2019) which expects development to integrate into its surroundings and ensure a satisfactory degree of amenity for neighbouring properties.
9. The proposal would also conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) (2021) that outlines, amongst other things, are visually attractive as a result of good architecture; and that the development will function well and add to the overall quality of the area.

Other Matters

10. The appellant has referred to other properties in the surrounding area that have been altered in a similar manner to that which is proposed. I observed a number of these on my site visit, including the front extension to the adjacent property, and the recent approval for additional extensions. Although I do not have the full details of the background in relation to these extensions to other properties, they are crucially in different contexts to that of the appeal property. Some of the examples I observed also served to confirm the harm that can be done in relation to inappropriate extensions. I have also, in any event, determined the appeal on its own individual planning merits.
11. I have also noted the personal reasons of the appellant for seeking to extend the property. These however have little weight in the appeal and do not override the harm I have identified.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, I therefore conclude that the appeal be dismissed.

Paul Cooper

INSPECTOR