



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 February 2022

by J D Westbrook BSc(Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3rd March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/J3015/D/22/3290760

181 Bye Pass Road, Beeston, NOTTINGHAM, NG9 5HR

- 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 Vladimir Macoveiciuc against the decision of Broxtowe Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/00250/FUL, dated 23 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 8 December 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as the construction of a single-/two-storey front/side extension and a replacement wall along part of side boundary.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the construction of a single-/two-storey front/side extension and a replacement wall along part of side boundary at 181 Bye Pass Road, Beeston, NOTTINGHAM, NG9 5HR in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/00250/FUL, dated 23 March 2021, and the plans submitted with it, 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 plans: VM-PL-102, VM-PL-103

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed extensions on the character and appearance of the area around Bye Pass Road.

Reasons

3. The appeal property (No 181) is a detached house situated on the eastern side of Bye Pass Road, almost opposite to its junction with Perkins Way. It has a detached garage to the northern side, with a gate and path running between it and the main house. The house has a two-storey rear extension and a very long rear garden that runs at an angle away from the alignment of the house itself. The front elevation of the garage is around 2.5 metres forward of the main front elevation of the house, and is built up against the side boundary with the neighbouring No 179. There are tall conifer hedges to the front and southern boundaries and to the front part of the northern boundary.

4. The proposed development would involve the demolition of the garage and the construction of a two-storey front/side extension, projecting forward of the main front elevation to a point equivalent to the existing front elevation of the garage. It would be attached to the existing house and would be set in from the boundary with No 179 by around 1 metre. The two-storey extension would also include an element at the front of the existing house which would link the side extension to the rest of the house, and which would have a gable frontage and a new front entrance to the house. There would be a small, single-storey front extension at the southern side of the house, adjacent to the new front entrance. Finally there would be a new side wall to replace the side elevation of the garage that currently forms part of the boundary with No 179.
5. The Council contends that the proposed extensions and re-modelling of the detached dwelling, by virtue of their scale, massing and design, would fail to make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area, dominating the existing building.
6. The appellant contends that the appeal property is sited within a part of the street scene where there is a lack of architectural cohesiveness, and that the adjacent dwellings, as well as those opposite, are all materially different. These all form part of the established character of the area. Moreover, it is set back a significant distance from the highway, on a generously sized plot. Finally, it would add only a small amount to the overall footprint of the existing property and that the extension would be suitably scaled in relation to the dwelling, integrating well with the scale and proportions of the host property.
7. Policy 10 of the Broxtowe Aligned Core Strategy 2014 (CS) indicates, amongst other things, that structure, texture and grain; massing, scale and proportion; and materials, architectural style and detailing, will be considerations when assessing development. Policy 17 of the Council's Local Plan 2019 (Part Two) (LP) states that extensions should be of a size, siting and design that makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area and does not dominate the existing building or appear over-prominent in the street scene.
8. In this case, I note that there is no clear building line formed by the dwellings on the eastern side of the road from No 179 southwards. The proposed extensions would project only a little forward of the existing front elevation of the house and would not project beyond the line of the existing garage. I acknowledge that the current boundary planting could be removed at any time, so increasing the visibility of the property, but the proposed extension would still be set back from the front boundary by a significant amount and would not become a prominent feature in the street scene.
9. The creation of the narrow, central two-storey element of the extension would serve to integrate the new extensions with the rest of the house. It would also, to a large extent, mirror the gabled frontages of the recently constructed houses on the western side of Bye Pass Road, and would be sympathetic to the overall appearance of No 188 opposite, as well as the new corner property fronting Perkins Way. In addition, Nos 185 and 187 present the appearance of a wide-fronted dwelling in the streetscape, while No 191 is a house of substantial scale and massing, with what appears to be a large two-storey side extension. On this basis, I do not consider that the extension at No 181 would appear out of context or overly dominant in the surrounding street scene.

10. Whilst some of the materials used in the proposed extensions would be contemporary, there is no established style or appearance to the properties in the immediate vicinity. The use of render to the main façade would appear appropriate in the context of the surrounding area, and the proposals for uniform window details and roof design/materials would result in the extensions and original house appearing as a coherent unit.
11. In conclusion, I consider that the proposed extensions at No 181 would make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area and would not dominate the existing building or appear over-prominent in the street scene. For this reason, I find that the proposed development would not be harmful to the character or appearance of the area around Bye Pass Road and it would not conflict with Policy 10 of the CS or with Policy 17 of the LP.

Conditions

12. I have attached a condition relating to plans because it is necessary that the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

J D Westbrook

INSPECTOR