



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 January 2022

**by Paul Cooper MSc MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 23 February 2022**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/N1025/D/21/3284391**

**5, The Hollies, Sandiacre, Nottingham NG10 5HN**

- 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 Michael Parsons against the decision of Erewash Borough Council.
  - The application Ref ERE/0621/0072, dated 24 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 19 August 2021.
  - The development proposed is increase of ridge height by 450mm and insertion of rear flat roofed dormer and front facing rooflights.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Main Issue

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

### Reasons

3. The host property is a two-storey detached dwelling on a cul-de-sac. It has had planning approval for previous works. The property is located on the edge of the residential area, close to the M1 motorway.
4. There is a general uniformity to the detached dwellings on The Hollies. They are all designed in a similar manner, brick built with attached garages. This regularity of design and construction materials for the dwellings in this cul-de-sac adds positively and distinctively to the character and appearance of the area.
5. There is some variation in the building line as to the position of the plots, but the build regularity outweighs this point. The appeal dwelling seeking a roof height increase would affect the character and appearance of the area. While there are some alterations to the plots (including the host dwelling), this regularity adds to the character and appearance of the area.
6. I find that the significant increase in roof height would alter the appearance of the property in a negative manner as it is approached from the front, when seen in the context of the other properties within the cul-de-sac. This roof height increase would then form the method in which the rear dormer could be constructed. However, the design of the dormer does not follow the guidance set out in the Council's "Extending Your Home" Supplementary Planning Document in terms of a set-in from the roof plane.

7. Whilst rear dormers are usually permitted development, the raising of the roof in order to accommodate the dormer is a factor that weighs heavily against the rear dormer and would lead to an unsightly extension which would be visible from other properties in the locality.
8. In summary, I consider the raising of the roof and the insertion of the rear dormer are banded together, and would cause material harm to the character and appearance of the area, conflicting with Policy DC2 of the Erewash Local Plan (2014) and Policy 10 of the Erewash Core Strategy (2014) which, amongst other matters, expect development to be of a scale and design that is in keeping with the dwelling to be extended, neighbouring properties and the surrounding area, as well as the guidance set out in the Extending Your Home SPD.

### **Other Matters**

9. I have noted the comments of the appellant in relation to the previous extension, but I must deal with the appeal on its own merits and have identified harm in my assessment.

### **Conclusion**

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

*Paul Cooper*

INSPECTOR