



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 December 2022

by Ian McHugh DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 January 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/J3015/D/22/3309278

86 Baker Road, Newthorpe, Nottinghamshire, NG16 2DP

- 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 Josef Smereka against the decision of Broxtowe Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 22/00421/FUL, dated 15 May 2022, was refused by notice dated 17 August 2022.
 - The development proposed is ground floor front and rear extension and hip to gable roof conversion with dormer windows.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of both the existing dwelling and the streetscene.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a small detached single-storey bungalow with a hipped roof, which is situated in a residential area. The rear garden backs onto open countryside and its rear elevation is clearly visible from a public footpath which leads from Baker Road into the adjoining field.
4. Other dwellings in the vicinity of the appeal site vary in terms of their size, age and appearance. These include two-storey houses, other single-storey bungalows and properties that were single-storey, but have been extended to provide accommodation within roof areas. One of these includes the neighbouring dwelling at number 84 Baker Road (number 84). Several dwellings have also been extended and altered at the rear. A single-storey bungalow adjoins the site on the other side of the appeal property at number 88.
5. The proposal is to substantially alter and extend the dwelling by constructing ground floor front and rear additions and a hip to gable roof extension with front and rear dormers. Solar panels would also be installed on the rear roof slope.
6. The Council states that the proposal would be visually dominant within the streetscene and would be detrimental to the character of the area and the existing dwelling by virtue of its design, scale and mass. It contends that it

would conflict with both Policy 10 of the Broxtowe Aligned Core Strategy 2014 and Policy 17 of the Broxtowe Part 2 Local Plan 2019. These policies seek (amongst other things) to ensure that new development makes a positive contribution to the area and has regard to local context and integrates with its surroundings. The Council indicates that a revised proposal with a lower roof height would be more sympathetically received.

7. Taken in isolation, I am not persuaded that the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character or appearance of the dwelling. However, with regard to the streetscene, although there would be a degree of separation at roof level between the appeal property and the neighbouring dwellings, the increased bulk and height of the extended dwelling would appear visually dominant and overly prominent. The ridge of the proposed roof would be taller than the dwellings on either side (including the recently extended height of number 84) and, in that regard, it would appear at odds with its immediate surroundings.
8. I have taken into account the mixture of house types along Baker Road and I agree with the Council that the principle of extending the appeal property would be acceptable. Its renovation and modernisation would also be a significant benefit. I have also noted existing ground levels. However, for the reasons given above, I find that the proposal would have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the streetscene. Therefore, it would conflict with the provisions of the Development Plan, as referred to above.

Other Matter

9. The appellant expresses his dissatisfaction over the way in which the Council dealt with the planning application. This is not something that I am able to comment on as part of this decision and it is matter between the two main parties.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, it is concluded that the appeal be dismissed.

Ian McHugh

INSPECTOR