
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: 15 March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/B3030/D/22/3290907

2 Gainsborough Road, Winthorpe, NEWARK, NG24 2NN

- 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 Ms J Goodridge against the decision of Newark & Sherwood District Council.
 - The application Ref 21/02238/HOUSE, dated 24 September 2021, was refused by notice dated 21 December 2021.
 - The development proposed is the construction of a two-storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the area around Winthorpe Village.

Reasons

3. The appeal property (No 2) is a detached house situated in a plot on the western side of Gainsborough Road at the northern end of the village of Winthorpe. The main house, with a rear projection, was extended recently by way of a wide two-storey element on its eastern side. The proposed development would involve the construction of a two-storey extension to its western side. There is a large, detached triple garage to the east of the house, and other low-rise buildings to the north of the house that appear to be associated with equestrian activities in an adjacent open field.
4. To the west and north-west of the house, there are two further, recently constructed, houses, served by a shared driveway that branches off the main drive to the appeal property. All three houses are sited well back from the boundary of the appeal site with Gainsborough Road.
5. The Council contends that the proposed two-storey extension, by virtue of its siting, form and scale, would create a sprawling, incongruous dwelling, dominated by extensions that would have a detrimental impact on the character of the area and the openness of the surrounding countryside.
6. The appellant contends that the proposal will effectively “mirror” the previously approved extension which has been built out to the north-east of the ‘original’ dwelling and that it presents an opportunity to add a level of visual ‘balance’ to

the appearance of the property. Also, the extension would be constructed using a dressed facing stone on all elevations, with slate tiles being utilised on the pitched hipped roof, both of which would match the materials utilised in the existing dwelling. The appellant also notes that the land immediately to the north of the Site has been granted permission for the siting of 5 holiday lodges on appeal, and that planning permission was granted in 2017 (since lapsed) for a garage on a similar footprint to that of the current proposal.

7. Policy DM5 of the Council's Allocations and Development Management Development Plan Document (DPD) indicates that the character of the District's built form should be reflected in the scale, form, mass, layout, design, materials and detailing of proposals for new development. Policy DM6 indicates that planning permission will be granted for the alteration and extension of dwellings providing that the host dwelling retains a reasonable amount of amenity space relative to its size; that the proposal respects the design, materials and detailing of the host dwelling; and that it respects the character of the surrounding area, including its local distinctiveness and the open character of the surrounding countryside.
8. The Council's Householder Development Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) indicates that side additions to dwellings should be designed in a way which is sensitive to the host dwelling and prevailing character of the surrounding area. Also, the proposal should be successfully integrated with the host dwelling.
9. The dwelling currently comprises what appears to be the original house, in traditional style, with a half-hipped roof, a short, two-storey rear projection and a modern front porch; a single-storey rear extension with a balcony above; a modern, two-storey side extension around 10 metres wide; and a large detached triple garage a few metres away to the east. The existing side extension has a two-storey gable front with significant glazed elements, and a gable-fronted dormer window. Whilst the extension has a half-hipped roof, the largely glazed front elevation does not match the smaller window units in the original building. The tall gabled element on the extension mirrors the design of the modern front porch, although the porch does not sit easily with the more traditional design of the host property.
10. The recently constructed wide triple garage also has a tall, gabled front element with a glazed 'upper-storey', which effectively continues the design and materials of the side extension. These two elements of the house – garage and side extension – somewhat dominate the original host dwelling in both appearance and character. I note that the Council indicates that the existing extension already represents an increase of 87% over the footprint of the original main house. The extension was apparently recommended for approval, at least partly, because of the large extent of the site (approximately 2 ha at the time) and ample screening from the road. Since this time, the large triple garage has been added, and two detached houses also constructed on what was then the site of the appeal property alone.
11. The proposed extension would project some 8.5 metres from the existing western elevation of the house, and would be similar in style and materials to the existing side extension. It would have a gabled dormer style element at the front, and large glazed doors occupying most of the ground-floor front and rear elevations. The appellants contend that the proposed extension would

result in a more balanced appearance. However, I consider that it would result in the extensions overwhelming the original main house, causing it to appear incongruous in its context. The front elevation would be dominated by large modern glazed units, and there would be a discordant appearance to the eaves lines and window details across the frontage.

12. The appellant has made note of the recent permission to construct two new dwellings within the previous curtilage of the appeal property. However, the committee report accompanying the recommendation of council officers to the members states that 'The benefits of the scheme in terms of additional housing delivery must therefore be afforded positive weight. The remainder of the appraisal above assesses all other material planning considerations and does not identify any resultant harm which would outweigh the housing benefits. The proposal is therefore recommended for approval'. With regard to this proposal, there are no housing benefits to measure against any resulting harm.
13. The appellant also refers to a recent appeal decision relating to a proposal for the construction of 5 low-rise holiday lodges on land to the north of the appeal site. In the decision letter, the inspector indicated that the appeal site appears as part of the open countryside blending in with the open fields to its north and mirroring the openness of the fields on the opposite side of Gainsborough road, and that the trees along its southwestern boundary form a strong visual border and separate the built-up part of the village from the site. The retained open fields at the front of the site would ensure the development retains an open and rural feel across most of the site. The letter goes on to say that the lodges' low profile, simple design and finishing materials would mean they would have an unmistakably different appearance to dwellings in the village, which means they would not appear as an extension of the village.
14. I note these points. However, the appeal site is something of a projection of the village built up area, which is generally developed at a higher density than the appeal site. The northern boundary of the village effectively ends at Thoroughfare Lane on the eastern side of Gainsborough Road, and the appeal site extends beyond a projection of this line on the western side. It is clear that the inspector considered that the holiday lodges would not fundamentally alter the open nature of the area to the north of the appeal site and, in my opinion, the current appeal site is something of a lower-density buffer between the higher-density development immediately to the south and the open countryside immediately to the north. The proposed extension at No 2 would represent an increasing density of development on a site that has already seen large extensions and additions to the original house, and the construction of two further houses. As such it would be harmful to the character of this low-density buffer, and thereby to the open countryside beyond.
15. The appellant considers the fact that a garage was approved as an extension to the western elevation of the house in 2017 is a relevant consideration in the determination of this appeal. However, this permission has lapsed and a detached garage has now been constructed to the east of the house. The circumstances regarding the suitability of the western side of the house for a garage have now therefore changed, since a large garage is now in place in an alternative location. On this basis, I do not consider that the earlier permission should be seen as a precedent for this current proposal, since there has been a significant amount of development carried out around the original house since 2017, which raise other issues, as discussed above.

Conclusion

16. In conclusion, I find that the proposed extension, when taken with other recent extensions and additions to the property, and alongside the construction of two new dwellings within the original curtilage, would represent an increase in the density of development on and around the site, to the detriment of the character and appearance of the host property within its plot and its wider surroundings. In addition, the design, materials, massing, and scale of the proposed extension would result in the host property appearing as an incongruous element within the context of the overall dwelling. It would not, therefore, on this basis, integrate well with the host dwelling.
17. In the light of the above, I conclude that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property and the wider surroundings of the village of Winthorpe and the open countryside around it. It would conflict with Policies DM5 and DM6 of the DPD, and also with guidance in the SPD. Accordingly, I dismiss the appeal.

J D Westbrook

INSPECTOR