



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 May 2022

by A M Nilsson BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 June 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/A3010/D/22/3291228

Alexander House, Cross Street, Sturton Le Steeple DN22 9HW

- 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 Kevin Booth against the decision of Bassetlaw District Council.
 - The application Ref 21/01329/HSE, dated 24 August 2021, was refused by notice dated 2 November 2021.
 - The development proposed is a swimming pool extension to rear of house and portico to front of house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area, including the setting of nearby listed buildings.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two storey detached dwelling. It is set back from the roadside behind a wall and hedging and is situated on a large plot with large rear garden. The dwelling is of a traditional rural appearance to reflect its setting. It has a two storey rear off-shoot and a well defined double pitched roof to the main body of the dwelling.
4. The proposed development has two distinct elements, namely the swimming pool extension to the rear and the portico to the front.
5. The proposed rear extension would be single storey and would project from the rear off-shoot of the property before turning 90 degrees to form an 'L' shape overall. Although the extension would be a sizeable addition to the property a substantial garden area would remain. Additionally, due to its size and siting to the rear of the property, it would be subservient and would not dominate the host property. There would be no harm caused in this regard. Due to its size and siting, it would also not be readily visible from the roadside.
6. The extension would include a pronounced, long sloping, hipped roof over the swimming pool section. Such a design would be in stark contrast with the pleasant and characteristic, well-defined pitched roofs used in the rest of the dwelling, and generally throughout the wider area. Therefore, its roof design

would be out of character and sit uncomfortably with the remainder of the dwelling and cause harm in this regard.

7. The proposed portico would be centrally sited to the front elevation. Due to its siting, it would be more prominent when viewed from the street-scene. Its mock classical design would be wholly at odds with the traditional and simple rural design of the dwelling, needlessly drawing the eye. Its design would therefore cause harm to the character and appearance of the dwelling. I observed on my site visit the more traditionally designed porticos to the properties opposite the appeal site, reflective of their rural design and setting.
8. The Council have referred to the impact of the proposed development on the setting of nearby listed buildings, namely the grade II listed Barn at Cross Street and the grade II listed Cross Street Cottage and Outhouse.
9. These buildings are characterised by their location in a rural village amongst other buildings. They are separated from the appeal site by a field. Although the proposed development would be partly visible from these listed buildings, I find that given the separation, and the relatively low scale nature of the proposed development, there would not be harm to the setting of these listed buildings.
10. I therefore conclude that due to its design, the proposed development would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. It would be contrary to Policy DM4 of the Bassetlaw Core Strategy and Development Management Policies DPD (2011) which requires, amongst other things, that new development is of high-quality design and respect its context.

Conclusion

11. The proposed development would therefore conflict with the development plan and there are no other considerations, including the National Planning Policy Framework, that outweigh this conflict.
12. For the reasons set out above, and having had regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

A M Nilsson

INSPECTOR