



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 October 2023

by Elaine Benson BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15.11.2023

Appeal Ref: APP/B3030/D/23/3328192

Bridge Cottage, Rufford Lane, Wellow, Nottinghamshire NG22 0EQ

- 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 Gregg Parkin against the decision of Newark and Sherwood District Council.
 - The application Ref 23/00665/HOUSE, dated 3 April 2023, was refused by notice dated 7 June 2023.
 - The development proposed is described as 'converting existing loft room into a purpose-built loft en-suite bedroom with internal staircase from main house. There will be a pitched dormer to the front elevation and a new larger opening to the rear, overlooking fields with a small, glazed balcony area within existing roof structure'.
-

Preliminary Matter

1. Following the determination of the planning application, the appellant submitted a revised drawing of the front elevation to the Council and also for consideration in this appeal. The Council's comments upon the revisions are noted, including its continuing view that the proposal is unacceptable. Nonetheless, I am required to determine the scheme that was before the Council when it made its decision. Accordingly, this decision is not based upon the revised drawings.

Decision

2. The appeal is dismissed.

Reasons

3. Bridge Cottage stands alone in open countryside, surrounded by mature trees. It is an individually designed house featuring gables and dormer windows. The front of the house is visible from the road. There are limited views of the rear of the property from a distant public footpath.
4. The proposed front dormer would extend almost from the ridge to the eaves and its overall size would reflect that of the front entrance porch. This would result in a top-heavy roof. The excessive size, discordant appearance and the extent of glazing of the front dormer would not reflect the scale and detailing of the existing front dormers. I conclude that the proposed dormer window would dominate the existing roof slope and appear unbalanced and incongruous. It would harm the character and appearance of Bridge Cottage. There is insufficient evidence to demonstrate that the size of front dormer as proposed is necessary to provide access to the roof area. But in any event, alternative staircase designs may well be available.

5. The rear window and balcony dormer would be an addition to the existing simple form and design of the roof. It would be confined to one area and would be set below the roof ridge. However, its design would not reflect the proportions of the other fenestration on the rear of the property, including the conservatory glazing. Furthermore, its height and width would be only slightly smaller than those of the conservatory, resulting in an oversized, bulky and disproportionate roof level extension. The rear dormer would harm the character and appearance of Bridge Cottage. I have considered the proximity of the house to a heavily treed area and the absence of any public views of the rear of the property. Nonetheless, this element of the appeal proposal does not amount to good design and would result in an obtrusive and dominating addition to the rear roof that would be out of character.
6. I conclude overall that the proposed design, scale, massing and form of the dormer windows would appear incongruous and would harm the appearance of the host dwelling. The proposal is therefore contrary to Core Policy 9 (Sustainable Design) of the Newark and Sherwood Amended Core Strategy DPD (2019) (DPD), Policies DM5 (Design) and DM6 (Householder Development) of the Allocations and Development Management DPD (2013).
7. I am not convinced by the Council's evidence that the character of the surrounding rural landscape would be affected by the appeal proposal which involves roof level alterations to an existing building without any increase in footprint. Accordingly, I conclude that there would be no conflict with DPD Core Policy 13 (Landscape Character).

Elaine Benson

INSPECTOR