



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 January 2023

by K Allen MEng (Hons) MArch PGCert ARB

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 February 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/J3015/D/22/3290595

74 Abbey Road, Beeston NG9 2QH

- 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 C Burton against the decision of Broxtowe Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/00756/FUL, dated 9 September 2021, was refused by notice dated 3 December 2021.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side extension, single storey rear extension & Loft Conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The development has already been constructed, for the avoidance of doubt the appeal has been determined based on the appeal drawings.
3. During my site visit I observed that a rear dormer has been constructed at the adjoining property, No 76 Abbey Road. The Council has confirmed that planning permission has been refused for the dormer window¹. Therefore, I have not had regard to it in my decision.
4. The parties agree that the two storey side extension, single storey rear extension and front dormer on the appeal drawings are acceptable.

Main Issue

5. Having regard to the above, the main issue is the effect of the rear dormer on the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons

6. The surrounding area is residential and characterised by a combination of detached and semi-detached properties of a similar age. There is some variety in the style and design of roofs in the area, however the majority of roofs are unaltered with only a small number of rear dormers visible.
7. Whilst the dormer sits slightly down from the ridge line and in from the edges, it extends fully across the rear roof slope, including the side extension. Despite the use of matching materials, when viewed in combination with the other elements of the development, the dormer dominates the host property and appears disproportionate. The massing of the dormer is unnecessarily

¹ Application Ref: 22/00861/FUL

complicated with a staggered elevation and an overhanging roof to one side. Further, the alignment of the dormer windows does not relate to the elevation of the building, drawing attention to its incongruous size and design.

8. Although the dormer is not visible from Abbey Road, it is clearly visible from the surrounding streets. In these views the dormer is a prominent and unattractive addition to the street scene that looks harmfully out of place.
9. I therefore conclude that the rear dormer harms the character and appearance of the host property and the area, in conflict with Policy 10 of the Broxtowe Borough, Gedling Borough and Nottingham City Aligned Core Strategies Part 1 Local Plan and Policy 17 of the Broxtowe Borough Council Part 2 Local Plan 2018-2028 which together seek to ensure that new development integrates with its surroundings, dormers do not dominate the roof slope and that massing, scale and proportion are key considerations. It is also in conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which seeks to ensure development adds to the overall quality of the area and is visually attractive as a result of good architecture.

Other Matters

10. The appellant suggests that the rear dormer does not need planning permission however, no substantive evidence has been provided on this matter.
11. My attention has been drawn to details of a dormer extension on Sherwin Road. However, I note that elements of the design including the size and window detailing are different. Further, that property does not appear to have been extended at the rear and is some distance from the appeal site where the character of the area is not the same.
12. The appellant raises concerns that the Council has not acted positively and proactively in the determination of this application, while this is unfortunate it has not affected my consideration of this appeal.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the development conflicts with the development plan as a whole and the Framework. There are no other matters which would outweigh that conflict. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

K Allen

INSPECTOR