
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 March 2023

by Ryan Cowley MPlan (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 April 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/W3005/D/22/3312806

89 Sutton Road, Kirkby in Ashfield, Nottinghamshire NG17 8GY

- 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 Lee Taylor against the decision of Ashfield District Council.
 - The application Ref V/2022/0630, dated 18 August 2022, was refused by notice dated 17 November 2022.
 - The development proposed is described in the appeal form as “two storey side & single storey rear extension and loft conversion and rendering to dwelling”.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. I observed during my site visit that a two-storey side extension has been constructed on site albeit appears to be unfinished. The development is therefore part-retrospective.
3. Various versions of the existing and proposed floor plans and elevation drawings have been provided. The Council has indicated which of these plans they considered in their decision¹. The appellant has provided no comment on this matter. I have therefore considered the plans referred to by the Council.
4. In the banner heading above, I have referred to the description of the development from the appeal form. This corresponds more closely with the considered plans and describes the development more precisely than that contained within the application form.
5. Planning permission was previously granted (ref V/2022/0322) for a two-storey side & single storey rear extensions and a loft conversion at the appeal site. The full details of this previous permission are not before me. However, the Council indicate that the extension has not been constructed in accordance with the approved plans, and this has not been disputed by the appellant.
6. The Council highlight that there are discrepancies in the considered plans. I also note, for example, that the front facing gable of the original dwelling has not been accurately represented. Notwithstanding this, I have been able to determine the appeal based on the information before me and my own observations. As the appeal is to be dismissed, I have not sought any further clarity or resolution on this matter.

¹ P101 Amended Existing Floor Plans and Elevations v2 (received 16 November 2022) and P201 _ 1 Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations (received 16 November 2022).

Main Issue

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

Reasons

8. The appeal site comprises one half of a pair of semi-detached two storey dwellings with a frontage onto Sutton Road. The original dwelling maintains much of its traditional appearance, form and character to the front, including a front facing projecting gable feature, ground floor bay window and a tiled canopy over the front door. It is finished in a red brick at ground floor and a light colour render to the first floor, with red roof tiles and white PVC windows. In these respects, it remains largely in keeping with its attached neighbour and, notwithstanding recent additions, the original pair of dwellings otherwise appear well balanced.
9. The surrounding area is characterised by a mix of detached and semi-detached dwellings of various sizes and designs. However, on the appeal site's side of Sutton Road and neighbouring streets behind, dwellings are often traditional in appearance, semi-detached and evenly spaced. Finishing materials locally are predominantly a red or brown brick, however light colour render also features, particularly along Sutton Road. Roof tiles are typically red or grey in colour.
10. The Council's Residential Extensions Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) November 2014 highlights that a poorly designed extension can spoil the appearance of a property and the street scene. It indicates that extensions should be sensitive to the proportions of the existing house and echo its architectural details. It also advocates that they be designed to look as if they are part of the original house and not an obvious addition.
11. The appeal scheme includes a two-storey extension to the side of the original dwelling, to be finished in a white render with black PVC windows. The roof of the extension is finished in flat concrete interlocking anthracite tiles. The side extension steps forward of the adjoining part of the front elevation of the original dwelling. It features a dual-pitched roof with a ridge height that sits slightly lower than that of the main roof. However, the roof of the extension also steps forward of that of the original dwelling.
12. I recognise grey roof tiles and white render are not particularly uncommon locally. However, the way in which the extension steps forward, rather than back, disassociates it from the original dwelling and gives it a dominant and incongruous appearance when viewed from the front. While the proposals include colouring red tiles on the roof of the original dwelling to match the anthracite colour of the roof of the extension, this would do little to successfully integrate it. Its poor relationship to the original dwelling and its attached neighbour would be emphasised by the proposed use of materials and their colour and combined the appeal scheme would significantly imbalance the pair of dwellings. Overall, it is contrary to guidance within the SPD and would detract from the prevailing character and visual amenity of the locality.
13. I conclude that the appeal scheme would harm the character and appearance of the original dwelling and surrounding area. It is therefore contrary to policies ST1 and HG7 of the Ashfield Local Plan Review – Adopted November 2002 which, among other provisions, seek to resist development that would

adversely affect the character, quality and amenity of the environment or the visual amenity of the locality. It is also contrary to chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2021 in respect of its aim of achieving well-designed places.

Conclusion

14. The proposed development conflicts with the development plan, taken as a whole, and I have found no material considerations that indicate the proposal should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. Consequently, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Ryan Cowley

INSPECTOR