



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 February 2022

by A Edgington BSc (Hons) MA CMLI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 February 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/B3030/D/21/3290000

67 Mansfield Road, Edwinstowe, Mansfield, Nottinghamshire, NG21 9NW

- 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 Mrs Rachel Beard against the decision of Newark & Sherwood District Council.
 - The application Ref 21/01888/HOUSE, dated 25 August 2021, was refused by notice dated 25 October 2021.
 - The development proposed is Two storey side extension over garage with 2no. window revisions.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. 67 Mansfield Road (No 67) is a dormer bungalow set back from the building line and located between a three storey double-fronted brick dwelling (No 65) and a two storey brick cottage style dwelling (No 69). Number 67's set back allows it notable smaller scale and building style to sit comfortably with its immediate neighbours.
4. Number 65 is the most forward dwelling in the building line in the immediate area, and is very prominent as a consequence of its two storey bays, and the decorative paired gables above. Number 67's flat roofed garage extends some way forward of its front elevation but nonetheless the garage and rear first floor flat roofed extension provide lateral separation between No 65 and No 67, albeit above first floor level. The gap and spaciousness around No 65 is accentuated by No 67's set back and flat roofed side extensions.
5. The development would add a first floor side extension to No 67, above the flat roofed garaged which is separated from No 65 by a side passage. The host dwelling's ridge would be extended across the extension's full width and a gable fronted extension, forward of the host dwelling would extend as far as the garage's front elevation.
6. The SPD¹ states that where a proposed addition projects from the front of elevation of a dwelling, its impact on the appearance of the property and

¹ Newark and Sherwood Local Development Framework, adopted November 2014

character of the surrounding area are of primary concern. With regard to side additions, the SPD states that particular concern should be paid to the gaps and spaces between development. In this case although the extension will sit within No 67's footprint, the first floor extensions will project forward of the host dwelling's pitched roof, and further to the side than is currently the case.

7. I appreciate that in terms of floor space, footprint and floor space the development could be considered to be subordinate. However, in terms of the visual impact on No 67's front elevation the forward gable would appear prominent and out of scale with the host dwelling. The limited lateral separation with No 65 would also appear incongruous as the dominant gable elevation would visually compete with that of No 65, but would be one storey lower.
8. The appellant sets out that the ridge of the forward gable would be more than one metre below the host dwelling's ridge but the levels on the drawings indicate that the set down would be significantly less than one metre.
9. The Council has found harm in relation to the proposed materials but my concerns arise from the bulk, massing and positioning of the forward extension in relation to No 65 and the development's overall impact on the street scene. Given No 67's overall relationship with the Mansfield Road frontage, I conclude that this would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the area.
10. I agree that the flat roofed garage and the flat roofed rear extension detract from the overall form and style of No 67. However, this does not alter my reasoning and there is nothing before me to indicate that alternative designs, more sympathetic to No 67's immediate context and the street scene could not be developed.
11. I also acknowledge that the overall style of the front extension is broadly in keeping with the typology of the host dwelling but in this context, I conclude that it is overly large and prominent.
12. The development comprises other elements but the Council's concern has focussed on the front extension. There is nothing before me to indicate that the Council has a concern in respect of other elements. Consequently I have considered the front elevation only in my reasoning.
13. As such the development would be contrary to Core Policy 9 of the Amended Core Strategy DPD and Policies DM5 and DM6 of the Allocations and Development Management DPD. These taken together seek to achieve a high standard of design, appropriate in form and scale to character and context. Nor would the development comply with the guidance set out in the National Planning Policy Framework regarding good design.

Conclusion

14. The appeal is dismissed.

A Edgington

INSPECTOR