



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 July 2022

by David Cross BA(Hons) PgDip(Dist) TechIOA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 August 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/J3015/D/22/3298624

4 Victoria Gardens, Watnall, Nottinghamshire NG16 1GZ

- 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 S Midgley against the decision of Broxtowe Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 22/0149/FUL, dated 21 February 2022, was refused by notice dated 25 April 2022.
 - The development proposed is first floor front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host building and the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a detached bungalow located in a corner at the head of a small cul-de-sac. It is one of 3 bungalows at the end of the streetscape, and although the design and layout of the bungalows varies, the ridge height and hipped roof design of the main element of the bungalows is relatively consistent. That said, the cul-de-sac also contains 2-storey dwellings, and it may be that the introduction of a 2-storey extension of an appropriate design would not be out of context.
4. However, the appeal proposal would consist of introducing a first floor extension on top of an existing ground floor offshoot, which currently has a lower ridge height than the main roof of the bungalow. Due to the narrow footprint of the offshoot and the resultant projection of the extension above the ridge of the main roof, the proposal would appear as a contrived and incongruous addition to the bungalow. This harm would be exacerbated due to the relative prominence of the site when approaching the head of the cul-de-sac, as well as the awkward contrast between the design of the proposal and the neighbouring bungalows.
5. The Council refers to the introduction of a window on the front elevation of the proposal. However, the placement and design of windows varies between the different dwellings, and within that context the proposed window would not appear unduly incongruous. However, a lack of harm on this specific matter

does not outweigh the harm I have identified in respect of other elements of the proposal.

6. Reference has been made to an alternative design suggested by the Council, which the appellant has decided not to pursue and has expressed concerns in relation to appearance. However, the acceptability or otherwise of this alternative proposal does not fall within the remit of this appeal.
7. I am mindful that the assessment of character and appearance is a subjective matter. But this does not lead me to a different conclusion on the proposal based upon my own observations.
8. I have also had regard to the intentions of the appellant to improve accommodation for their family, including for home-working. But this private benefit would not be sufficient to outweigh the significant harm I have identified.
9. I conclude that, due to its scale, proportion and location, the proposal would lead to significant harm to the character and appearance of the host building and the area. The proposal would therefore be contrary to the design considerations of Policy 10 of the Aligned Core Strategy 2014 and Policy 17 of the Broxtowe Part 2 Local Plan 2019.
10. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

David Cross

INSPECTOR