



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 February 2023

by C Harding BA(Hons) PGDipTRP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24th February 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/B3030/W/22/3308918

5 Sheridan Close, Balderton NG24 3RB

- 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 Daniel Heath against the decision of Newark & Sherwood District Council.
 - The application Ref 20/02374/HOUSE, dated 1 December 2020, was refused by notice dated 8 August 2022.
 - The development proposed is Two Storey Front, Side and Rear Extensions and Internal Alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. Although the submitted planning application identified both Daniel Heath and Lucy Gamgee as applicants, only Daniel Heath is identified as the appellant on the appeal form. Accordingly, I have proceeded with the appeal in the name of Mr Daniel Heath only.
3. On the application form the development is described as "Proposed Two Storey Front and Side Extension and Internal Alterations". The Council amended the description of the development to "Proposed Two Storey Front, Rear and Side Extensions". Whilst the evidence includes no reference to any agreement by the appellant to this change in description, it has been used on the appeal form, and in any case more accurately describes the development proposed. Accordingly, I have also used the Council's amended description.
4. The Council based its decision upon revised plans that had not been subject to public consultation. In the interests of natural justice, interested parties have been afforded opportunity to comment on the revised plans as part of the appeal process. Accordingly, I have also considered the appeal on the basis of these plans.
5. The provided plans include a front porch being indicated on the site plan. However, the porch is not shown on the ground floor plan or any of the elevations or visualisations. The evidence indicates that a front porch has been removed from the proposal, and I have considered the appeal on the basis that it no longer forms part of the proposal.

Main Issue

6. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

7. The appeal property comprises a detached property with attached garage to the side located within a cul-de-sac. The property has previously been extended to the rear by means of a large single storey extension. Properties within the immediate vicinity of the appeal site are generally of similar scale, and appearance to the appeal property, although there are also some bungalows evident further into the cul-de-sac.
8. Although some properties have been extended and altered, the character of the street is one of reasonable uniformity in terms of the general form of properties, and it exhibits a spacious ambience which results from the gaps between the detached properties and above attached flat roof garages.
9. The proposal would result in a large gable frontage addition to the appeal property, extending over the existing garage and part of the existing main front elevation. Due to the height and width of the proposal, this would dominate the front elevation of the property and significantly alter its character.
10. As a result, the appeal property would appear significantly larger than those which can be found in the immediate vicinity and would lead to the loss of the space between the appeal property and its neighbour. This would interrupt the rhythm of the street, and would erode the current spacious character, and would consequently harm the character and appearance of the area.
11. Other properties in the road have been extended, including extensions over garages and gable frontages. However, other examples which would form the context of the appeal site are of a clearly smaller scale, and do not have the dominance that would result from the appeal proposal.
12. My attention has been drawn to other examples of extensions similar to that proposed which have been constructed elsewhere in the locality. Of these cited examples, one is located at the end of cul-de-sac and is therefore not in a wholly comparable position within the street. The other relates to a detached property located between semi-detached properties and bungalows, in a position which does not exhibit the same uniformity and rhythm of Sheridan Close. Furthermore, these examples are located some distance from the appeal site, and the proposal would not be viewed within the same context as them. Accordingly, I consider that they would not justify or overcome the harm that I have identified.
13. The proposal would lead to harm to the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore be contrary to Core Policy 9 of the Newark and Sherwood Local Development Framework Amended Core Strategy [2019], as well as Policies DM5 and DM6 of the Newark and Sherwood Local Development Framework Allocations and Development Management Development Plan Document [2013], which together, and amongst other criteria require new development to be of a high standard of design, of a scale and form appropriate to its context, and reflect local distinctiveness in terms of scale, form and mass.
14. There would also be conflict with paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework which advises that developments should be sympathetic to local character, and the Sherwood and Newark Local Development Framework

Householder Development Supplementary Planning Document [2014] which advises that in the case of front elevation additions, that regard should be given to whether the proposal would introduce a dominant feature which would be harmful to the appearance of the host dwelling, or the character of the surrounding area.

Other Matters

15. Although raised as a matter of concern by interested parties, the Council has raised no concern with regard to the effect of the proposal upon the living conditions of occupiers of existing properties. Even if I were to agree that the proposal would not lead to harm with respect to this, it would only be a neutral factor that would not weigh in favour of the proposal. As I am dismissing the appeal on the main issue for the reasons given above, I have not pursued this matter further.
16. I acknowledge the appellant's desire to extend the property, and that the proposal has been revised from that originally submitted to the Council in order to seek to address some of the concerns raised. Nevertheless, I have found that the proposal, as revised, would nevertheless result in harm to the character and appearance of the area, and I am mindful that such harm would be permanent.

Conclusion

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

C Harding

INSPECTOR