
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/22/3298942

86 Sandfield Road, Arnold NG5 6QJ

- 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 & Mrs L Staniforth against the decision of Gedling Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2021/1236, dated 22 October 2021, was refused by notice dated 18 March 2022.
 - The development proposed is 'front porch, front gable roof extension, 2nd floor rear extension and 1st floor window in the north-eastern elevation'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. I have taken the description of the proposed development from the Council's Decision Notice rather than the Application Form as it is more accurate.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene within which it sits.

Reasons

4. The appeal relates to a detached dwelling. Although the appeal dwelling sits within a road which is home to a range of dwelling types, it is located at the end of a group of five detached houses which are of a traditional inter-war style, with each having a prominent feature gable to the left side of their front elevations. These properties make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the street scene.
5. The proposal seeks to introduce a modest porch to the front elevation of the host dwelling. The Council raises no issue with this element of the scheme, explaining that it amounts to 'permitted development'. It would therefore serve no planning purpose for me to consider it further.
6. The proposal also seeks to provide additional accommodation within the roof. This would be partly achieved by creating a flat roof to the existing projecting bay and remodelling the feature gable by recessing it to the eaves, enlarging its width, increasing its pitch and increasing its height to the existing ridge. A window would also be introduced within the centre of the enlarged gable at second floor level.

7. To my mind, the overall scale of the altered gable would completely change the proportioning and appearance of the host dwelling. It would appear overly large and dominant within the roofscape whilst the proposed second floor window extending into the apex would not relate well to the proportioning of the existing fenestration. In addition, the introduction of a flat roof to cover the projecting bay would appear somewhat awkward. For these reasons, I find that this element of the scheme would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling.
8. The proposal also includes the introduction of a box dormer which would span the full width of the rear roof profile of the appeal dwelling. It would sit directly on the eaves and just below the ridge. Given these dimensions, the box dormer would engulf the rear roof profile and it would appear as an overly bulky addition. This element of the scheme would also harm the traditional character and form of the host dwelling.
9. As explained, the appeal dwelling sits at the end of a group of five similar houses. Whilst they have been the subject of some alterations and extensions over the years, they still exhibit a broad uniformity. The presence of this group only exacerbates the impact of the proposed alterations to the front of the appeal dwelling.
10. I am mindful that a dwelling with a full width gabled frontage sits immediately to the south-east of the appeal property at No. 84 Sandfield Road. However, this dwelling is of an entirely different style and scale and it sits further back on the plot. As a result, it is not read as part of the group, unlike the appeal dwelling.
11. The proposed alterations to the front of the appeal dwelling would be widely visible from the public domain, whilst the rear box dormer would also be visible from certain vantage points along Sandfield Road, given the recessed position of the dwelling at No. 84. For these reasons, I consider that the development proposed would harm the overall character of this particular section of the Sandfield Road street scene.
12. The Appellants argue that the proposal amounts to the efficient use of land without the loss of garden and is sustainable development. However, as they note, the National Planning Framework (the Framework) explains that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development. I have outlined 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.
13. The Appellants assert that the proposal would provide a better functioning dwelling and much needed additional family space, whilst a traditional two storey extension would be much more expensive and could impact on the living conditions of neighbours. Whilst I sympathise with the Appellant's position, these factors do not justify a visually harmful form of development.
14. Finally, I note the Appellants have expressed disappointment with the manner in which the Council determined the application. However, this is not a matter for me to consider.
15. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene within which it sits.

In such terms, it conflicts with policy 10 of the Council's adopted Aligned Core Strategy and policy LPD 43 of the Council's adopted Local Planning Document which promote high quality design that makes a positive contribution to the public realm.

16. The arguments advanced by the Appellants do not outweigh this visual harm and the associated policy conflict therefore the appeal does not succeed.

David Fitzsimon

INSPECTOR