



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 May 2022

by Benjamin Clarke BA (Hons.) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17th May 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/B3030/D/21/3286560

110 Westgate, Southwell NG25 0LT

- 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 Aaron Cambden against the decision of Newark & Sherwood District Council.
 - The application Ref 21/00932/HOUSE, dated 8 April 2021, was refused by notice dated 23 August 2021.
 - The development proposed is Single storey rear extension with minimal internal works and external landscaping.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue relevant to this appeal is the effect of the development upon the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site consists of a house located near to other dwellings, which are arranged in a broadly linear pattern. In addition, the appellant's dwelling and the neighbouring houses are constructed from a traditional form of architecture. Although some dwellings feature rear outriggers, these maintain the linear character of the vicinity. As part of the traditional style of architecture that characterises the appeal site and the surrounding properties, a defining feature is the presence of pitched roofs.
4. The proposed extension would have a significant height in that the highest point would be located just under the first-floor windows located on the rear elevation of the existing dwelling. In consequence, although the proposed extension would be of a single storey, the development would have a significant bulk and mass. It would therefore not appear to be a subordinate addition to the building.
5. Furthermore, the proposed extension would have a width greater than the outrigger to which it would be attached. Therefore, the proposal would erode the linear character of the appeal site and the surrounding area by reason of its proportions.
6. In addition, the proposed development would feature a flat roof. This means that the proposed development would appear discordant when viewed against the pitched roofs that are the predominant form of development within the

vicinity of the appeal site. This would therefore exacerbate the generally incongruous form of development.

7. These characteristics would arise even though the proposed extension would feature some characteristics that appear in the existing dwelling, such as the general palette of materials and some brick detailing. Whilst these ensure that there would be some similarities between the existing dwelling and proposed extension, it would not overcome the adverse effects arising from the proposal's height and bulk.
8. I acknowledge that it is unlikely that the proposed extension would be visible from public viewpoints within the surrounding area. However, the proposal would be viewable from several of the neighbouring dwellings including, at least in part, the properties to the rear of the appeal site. This means that the proposal would be readily perceptible.
9. In addition, the height of the proposed extension is such that it would be viewable over the site's boundary treatments. Therefore, the proposed extension would be viewable from a number of different vantage points. In consequence, it would be a strident addition to the building and the absence of viewpoints from public areas does not allow me to disregard my previous concerns.
10. Although the proposed development would include additional landscaping to the rear garden of the appeal site, this would not overcome the adverse effects arising from the design and massing of the proposed extension.
11. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would have an adverse effect upon the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The development, in this regard, would conflict with Core Policy 9 of the Newark and Sherwood Amended Core Strategy (2019); Policies DM5 and DM6 of the Allocations and Development Management DPD (adopted 2013); Policies DH1 and SD1 of the Southwell Neighbourhood Plan (2016); and the Householder Development Supplementary Planning Document (2014).
12. Amongst other matters these require that new developments achieve a high standard of sustainable design; reflect the character of built form; reflect the character of the surrounding area; ensure that the scale of the extension respects, and is balanced, with the proportions of the original dwelling; and is carried out in accordance with the Southwell Design Guide.

Other Matters

13. The appeal site is situated within the Southwell Conservation Area (the CA). Whilst I must give consideration to the effect of the development upon the character and appearance of the CA, I am mindful that as I have concluded that the proposed development is unacceptable, it would not result in change to the appearance of the CA. I therefore do not need to give this matter further consideration. Whilst this is a matter of note, it is only one of all the matters that must be assessed and therefore does not outweigh my findings in respect of the main issue.
14. The proposed development is unlikely to lead to an adverse effect upon the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties or their accesses. In addition, I note that objections were not received to the submitted planning application. However, these points do not overcome my previous conclusions.

Conclusion

15. The proposed development would have an adverse effect upon the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The scheme would therefore conflict with the development plan taken as a whole. There are no material considerations, including the National Planning Policy Framework, that indicate the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, for the preceding reasons, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Benjamin Clarke

INSPECTOR