



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 September 2022 by Andreea Spataru BA (Hons) MA

Decision by Chris Forrett BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13th December 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/B3030/D/22/3303382

Trent Holme Cottage, High Street, North Clifton, Nottinghamshire NG23 7AR

- 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 R Boucher against the decision of Newark & Sherwood District Council.
 - The application Ref 22/00728/HOUSE, dated 7 April 2022, was refused by notice dated 16 May 2022.
 - The development proposed is described as "Proposed replacement side and rear extension to replace existing single storey garage and rear extensions at Trentholme Cottage, High Street, North Clifton, Newark."
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and of the surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal relates to a detached, pitched-roofed, two-storey dwelling located on the western side of High Street within a residential area. The dwelling is set back from the road and has a single storey garage to the side, close to the northern boundary of the appeal site. It also has single storey extensions to the rear, that extend along the full width of the house and the garage, and a porch to the front.
 5. The properties located within the surrounding area vary in terms of scale, design and materials. Most of the neighbouring dwellings, particularly those on High Street, are set in from their side boundaries, albeit to different degrees.
 6. The proposal seeks to introduce a two-storey extension to the side and rear, to replace the existing garage and part of the rear extensions. The extension would have a similar sideways projection as the existing structure, would project slightly forwards of the front elevation of the host dwelling, as well as a much greater distance beyond the rear elevation of the original dwelling. It
-

- would have a pitched roof, with eaves and ridge heights higher than the existing. The existing porch would be removed, and a new porch would be added to the front of the proposed extension.
7. Due to its height, width and depth, particularly at the first-floor level, the two-storey extension would add significant mass and bulk to the side of the dwelling. To that extent, the host dwelling would be dominated by the massing of the extension, particularly when viewed from the northern side.
 8. This harm is exacerbated by the width of the front gable which would give the impression of a disproportionately wide extension which would be further accentuated by the difference in the eaves and ridge height, as well as the openings' placement.
 9. The proposal would also reduce the visual gap between the dwelling and its northern side boundary, principally as a result of the additional first floor accommodation. Whilst I consider that this is not determinative in isolation owing to the set-back from the road of the existing property, in combination with the height and bulk of the extension, it would result in some harm to the character and appearance of the area as it would dominate the host property.
 10. In coming to the above views, I have taken into account the appellant's reasons for the height of the extension, and I note the proposed materials would improve the overall appearance of the dwelling. However, due to its siting, overall scale and design of the proposal it would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the host dwelling.
 11. Whilst the variety within the surrounding area in terms of scale of properties and the gaps between them offers some flexibility in terms of design, the proposal, for the reasons set out above, would also affect the character and appearance of the surrounding area, albeit to a limited degree, rather than providing an overall balance in terms of scale and massing within the street context.
 12. I have also had regard to the recently built neighbouring properties located to the east of the appeal site. That said, these differ in terms of width of the plot and façade, scale, and the overall design to the appeal property and are not directly comparable.
 13. Finally, I acknowledge the Council's comments regarding the neighbouring property located to the north of the appeal site, "The Cottage", including those of the Conservation Officer, as well as the appellant's submissions on this matter. Whilst this property may be a non-designated heritage asset, in my view, the proposal would not result in any harm to it, or its setting. As such, the proposal is acceptable in this regard.
 14. Accordingly, I conclude that the proposal would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. Therefore, the development would be contrary to Core Policy 9 of the Newark and Sherwood Amended Core Strategy (2019) and Policies DM5 and DM6 of the Newark and Sherwood Allocations & Development Management Development Plan Document (2013), which collectively require, amongst other matters, that developments are of an appropriate form and scale to their context, complementing the existing built environment.

Other matters

15. The Appellant has drawn my attention to the fact that there have been no objections from neighbours and that the Council has found the proposal acceptable in terms of residential amenity. However, these are neutral matters rather than ones that carry weight in favour of the scheme.
16. Furthermore, whilst the proposal would no doubt bring benefits to the appellant, these are not sufficient to outweigh the harmful impact of the development.

Recommendation

17. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

Andreea Spataru

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

18. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Chris Forrett

INSPECTOR