
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 July 2022

by David Fitzsimon MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2 August 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/N3020/D/22/3296082
43 Milton Crescent, Ravenshead NG15 9BA

- 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 & Ms D & M Burgin & Green against the decision of Gedling Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2021/1404, dated 8 December 2021, was refused by notice dated 18 March 2022.
 - The development proposed is 'replacement roof incorporating dormer windows and single storey front extension'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues in this case are the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene within which it sits along with its effect on the living conditions of the occupier(s) of No. 41 Milton Crescent with particular regard to access to natural light.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal relates to a traditional bungalow with a shallow roof pitch. It is read as part of a group of bungalows immediately to the west which are of a broadly similar scale and height, taking into account the rising ground level of the highway. A dormer bungalow with a noticeably taller ridge height sits immediately to the east.
4. The proposal seeks to increase the ridge height and roof pitch of the appeal dwelling in order to accommodate rooms in the roof. They would be served by three dormers and two rooflights to the front elevation and one long mono-pitched dormer and two rooflights to the rear elevation. The introduction of a feature gable-fronted porch is also proposed to the front elevation.
5. The proposed roof alterations would radically alter the scale and appearance of the appeal dwelling. I am mindful that the dwelling to the east, No. 45 Milton Crescent, is noticeably taller with a much steeper roof pitch and it is of a different appearance to the group of bungalows to the west. However, according to the Appellants, the enlarged appeal dwelling would be some 900mm taller than the dwelling at No. 45. As a result, rather than transitioning

between the lower bungalows and the taller dwelling, it would appear oversized, disjointed and a jarring feature within the street scene.

6. For this reason, I find that the proposed enlargement would be disproportionate and would result in the appeal dwelling appearing incongruous within the street scene. In such terms, the proposal conflicts with policy 10 of the Council's adopted Aligned Core Strategy and policy LPD43 of the Council's adopted Local Planning Document (LPD), which promote high quality design that is in keeping with surrounding character.

Living conditions

7. The appeal dwelling sits directly on the boundary shared with No. 41 Milton Crescent, with only the width of the driveway of this neighbouring dwelling separating the side elevations of the two properties. The side elevation of No. 41 faces east and it has two windows. One serves a bathroom and the other provides the only source of light to the kitchen. Given the aspect and the relationship to the appeal dwelling, the side elevation of No. 41 will already be cast in some shadow at certain times of the day. The increase in the ridge height and roof pitch proposed would increase the overall bulk and massing of the side elevation of the appeal dwelling. Even accounting for the presence of a modest shed at No. 41 which is close to the kitchen window, the effect would cast more shadow. This would further reduce the levels of natural light available to the side elevation of No. 41 and its kitchen at certain times of the day, which is unacceptable.
8. In light of the above, I consider that the proposal would unacceptably reduce the levels of natural light available to the occupier(s) of No. 41 Milton Crescent. In such terms, it conflicts with policies LPD32 and LPD43 of the LPD, which seek to safeguard appropriate levels of residential amenity for neighbours.

Other matters

9. The Appellants refer to larger properties at Nos. 17A and 33 Milton Crescent. However, I do not know the precise planning circumstances behind these examples. In any event, I have considered the proposal before me on its merits and against the context of the particular section of the street scene within which the appeal dwelling sits.
10. The Appellants also assert that the proposal amounts to sustainable development. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) explains that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development. I have explained why the proposal does not amount to good design and therefore it does not amount to sustainable development in the widest sense of the definition provided by the Framework.

Overall Conclusions

11. I conclude that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene within which it sits and it would also unduly harm the living conditions of the occupier(s) of No. 41 Milton Crescent. The arguments advanced by the Appellants do not outweigh the harm and policy conflict therefore the appeal does not succeed.

David Fitzsimon INSPECTOR