
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 August 2022

by Steven Hartley BA (Hons) Dist.TP (Manc) DMS MRTPI MRICS
an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State.

Decision date: 17 August 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/J3015/D/22/3301055
12 Hope Street, Beeston NG9 1DR

- 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 Mrs Amina Gagieva against the decision of Broxtowe Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/00738/FUL, dated 1 September 2021, was refused by notice dated 25 March 2022.
 - The proposed development is a double storey side extension, single rear, double front building on existing single extension and bay window to be replaced with glass apex.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

The Main Issues

2. The main issues are the impact of the development upon (i) the character and appearance of the area and (ii) the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties in respect of outlook and privacy.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal property is in a predominantly residential area of mainly two-storey brick and render dwellings with largely unbroken hipped roofs, set back from the access road along generally common building lines and with small front amenity spaces.
4. The detached appeal building, while having these common characteristics, is somewhat taller than its neighbours, and especially in relation to the two bungalows which adjoin it, one on Hope Street and the other on Cyril Avenue. Its rendered, off-white, upper area under a hipped roof, located on the corner of Hope Street and Cyril Avenue, give it a somewhat imposing presence in the street scene.
5. The proposed development would add a two-storey front, side and rear extension including two hipped roof dormer windows to the front plus a roof light, and a flat roofed dormer and two roof lights to the rear, plus an

additional two storey front extension which would extend into the roof space and with a three-storey, fully glazed pitched front bay. To the rear would be a single extension with a double pitched roof. The roof to the property would be raised by approximately 0.9 metres and would be changed from a hip to a gable. The proposed development also includes a replacement single storey detached garage.

6. The whole building, existing and proposed, would be k-rendered and where cladding would be incorporated (such as between windows at ground floor and first floor levels). This would be coloured grey. The resulting property would have five bedrooms, an increase of two, (plus a guest room) and provision would be made for two parking spaces in addition to the proposed single garage.
7. While the proposed extensions would add significantly to the scale of the host property, it would continue to have a reasonable amount of amenity space around it and I do not consider that, in itself, the proposed development would be disproportionate or unacceptable in design terms.
8. However, the proposed development would significantly change the character and appearance of the host building when appreciated within the street scene. The three-storey glazed front gable would introduce an incongruous element and while on my site visit I was able to observe the occasional dormer window in the area, these were small and were the exception to largely unbroken roof lines. Furthermore, the change from a hipped roof to a gable would not accord with the prevailing roof patterns in the area. The proposed raising of the roof by approximately 0.9 metres would also give the building an unsatisfactory visual dominance in the street scene, especially when viewed alongside the bungalows to either side.
9. Therefore, I conclude that the proposed development would not accord with policy 10 of the Broxtowe Core Strategy 2014 (CS) which requires that new development should reinforce local characteristics and architectural styles, or with policy 17 of Part 2 of the Local Plan 2018 (LP) which requires new development to integrate into its surroundings and to make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area. In addition, it would not conform to chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2021 (the Framework) which gives great importance to the need for good design.

Living conditions – outlook and privacy

10. The host property adjoins the bungalow at No 14 Hope Street and where there are blank side elevations facing each other. The greatest impact upon the living conditions of the occupiers of the bungalow in terms of outlook and privacy would be the increase to the height of the host building and the proposed single storey extension. The latter, by its limited height would not have a significantly adverse impact upon privacy, and while the increased height of the building would give some adverse impact in terms of outlook, this would be limited to views from the outdoor amenity spaces of the bungalow and when viewed in a sideways direction from the front and rear of the property.
11. The proposed single storey rear extension to the host property would bring the building closer to its boundary with No.16 Cyril Avenue and especially to the

latter's rear amenity space. By its single storey height and position, I find that the proposed single storey extension would not have a materially harmful effect upon the outlook or privacy of the occupants of the bungalow. On my site visit, I was able to observe tree and other planting on the boundary between the properties and which, so far as the proposed single storey extension is concerned, would provide a degree of privacy to the occupants of the bungalow.

12. However, the incorporation of the box dormer would effectively add another storey to habitable rooms in the appeal property and this, plus the proposed additional overall height to the property, would have a significantly adverse impact upon the outlook and privacy of the occupants of the bungalow. The proposed use of obscure glass to the dormers (though not shown for the roof lights) would reduce the impact upon privacy, but not to outlook.
13. Therefore, when the proposal is considered as a whole, I conclude that it would fail to accord with policy 10 of the CS and policy 17 of the LP which aim to protect the amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring properties.

Conclusion

14. For the above reasons, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Steven Hartley

INSPECTOR