



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 August 2023

by C Livingstone MA(SocSci) (hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 September 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/B3030/D/23/3322394

48 Westbrook Drive, Rainworth, Nottinghamshire, NG21 0FB

- 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 David Abson against the decision of Newark and Sherwood District Council.
 - The application Ref 23/00342/HOUSE, dated 25 February 2023, was refused by notice dated 25 April 2023.
 - The development proposed is an attached side garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. Westbrook Drive is labelled as 'Rainworth Drive' on the submitted Location Plan, for the purposes of my assessment and in the interest of clarity I refer to Westbrook Drive.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed garage extension on the character and appearance of the surrounding residential area.

Reasons

4. The application relates to a house on a corner plot at the junction of Westbrook Drive and Kingfield Close. The property is two storeys, detached and on the end of a row of similar houses. Other properties within the immediate area are mainly single storey and detached. The general pattern of development within the area is of a fairly moderate density. This is reflected in dwellings being detached and set back from the road. Undeveloped gardens add to the visual qualities of the area, giving the surroundings a spacious quality.
5. Each house in the row is positioned close to one boundary of their plot, resulting in gaps between the properties. No. 48 has been extended to the side previously. The proposal would further extend the entire side elevation resulting in development across the width of the plot up to the boundary with Kingfield Close. The resultant dwelling would be significantly wider than the other properties in the row. Consequently, the property would be overly prominent and out of keeping with the group, and other properties within the immediate area, in terms of scale and massing.
6. As the application site is a corner plot, it is particularly important in providing an area of undeveloped land to both the front and side. This adds to the appearance of the street scene, allowing the entrance to Kingfield Close to feel

open and inviting. The height of the extension is emphasised by the topography of the site and this coupled with close proximity to the footpath would result in an overbearing impact. Narrowing the undeveloped area at the junction between Rainworth Drive and Kingfield Avenue further would make it feel enclosed and cramped.

7. For these reasons, I conclude that the development would harm the character and appearance of the surrounding residential area. It would therefore conflict with Core Policy 9 of the Newark and Sherwood Amended Core Strategy DPD (adopted March 2019), policies DM5 and DM6 of the Allocations and Development Management DPD (adopted July 2013) and the Householder Development SPD (adopted November 2014). These policies are consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework in requiring the new development respects local distinctiveness.

Other Matters

8. My attention has been drawn to other developments in the area. I do not have details of the circumstances that led to these proposals being accepted. On carrying out a site visit, I consider that they are not a direct parallel to the appeal proposal in respect of scale, design, location and use. In any case, I have determined the appeal on its own merits.
9. I understand that that the site benefits from permitted development rights. However, it is not clear to me that the alternative scheme suggested would be permitted development. It is open to the appellant to apply to the Council for a separate determination under sections 191/192 of the Act regardless of the outcome of the appeal. Consequently, I find the suggested alternative to have limited weight in the determination of the appeal.

Conclusion

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

C Livingstone

INSPECTOR