



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 November 2023

by K Savage BA(Hons) MPlan MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1st December 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/B3030/D/23/3328809

Cheveral House, Newark Road, Hockerton, Nottinghamshire NG25 0PW

- 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 J Saletti against the decision of Newark and Sherwood District Council.
 - The application Ref 23/00589/HOUSE, dated 30 March 2023, was refused by notice dated 12 June 2023.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side/front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two storey side/front extension at Cheveral House, Newark Road, Hockerton, Nottinghamshire NG25 0PW in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 23/00589/HOUSE, dated 30 March 2023, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Planning - Existing Plans (April 23); Planning - Site Plans (Amended Version May 2023); Planning - Proposed Plans (Amended Version May 23).
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be in accordance with the details shown on drawing Planning - Proposed Plans (Amended Version May 23).

Main Issue

2. The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal relates to a detached dwelling within spacious rural grounds to the southern side of the A617 Newark Road. There is a large hardstanding area to the front of the property; a private garden, stable buildings and manège to the rear and large paddock areas to either side of the dwelling. The site sits within open countryside, with a line of tree cover to the rear of the site enclosing it from wider view. The nearest neighbours in either direction along the A617 are some distance away and separated by open fields and hedgerows.
4. The existing dwelling stands perpendicular to the road. The proposed extension would attach to the inner flank wall and extend forward across the hardstanding area, creating an L-shaped footprint to the dwelling. Some of the existing outbuildings would be removed to accommodate the extension.

5. Core Policy 9 of the Amended Core Strategy (March 2019) (the ACS) requires new development to demonstrate a high standard of sustainable design that both protects and enhances the natural environment and contributes to and sustains the rich local distinctiveness of the District. This reflects the aims of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) to achieve high quality design.
6. Policies DM5 and DM6 of the Allocations & Development Management Development Plan Document (July 2013) (the ADM) require proposals to respect the design, materials and detailing of the host dwelling, and to respect the character of the surrounding area including its local distinctiveness, landscape character and the open character of the surrounding countryside.
7. The Council's Householder Development Supplementary Planning Document (November 2014) (the HDSPD) further sets out that the overall objective for any proposed addition should be based around its successful integration with the host dwelling and its surrounding area. It adds that a balanced visual relationship with the host dwelling and its features should be struck, being well related to the scale and proportions of the host dwelling and the characteristics of the application site in terms of size and shape.
8. The extension would be larger in footprint than the existing dwelling, and in this respect, it would represent a substantial increase in its overall size. However, as the appeal dwelling stands by itself, the extension is not required to match a particular pattern of development, but to integrate well with the existing dwelling to create an acceptable overall appearance.
9. When considering the overall site context, there is significant space to accommodate a larger extension and the enlarged dwelling would not appear excessive in site coverage or squeezed onto the plot. Rather, the L-shaped form is common to many rural buildings, particularly farmhouses with attached outbuildings. The surrounding area includes examples of large properties within spacious grounds, and in terms of scale and general form, the proposal would not be uncharacteristic.
10. Although large, the extension where it meets the existing dwelling would continue the orientation of the roof pitch, effectively elongating the 'original' side of the building which would add to its perceived size and conversely reduce the perceived size of the extension, the roof pitch of which would join at right angles. This roofscape arrangement would help to balance the old and new elements and avoid the impression of the extension overwhelming the existing dwelling. The slightly lower ground level and ridge height, narrower width and smaller dormer windows would also express the extension as a more secondary element of the building.
11. The dwelling itself is of relatively modern design, featuring simple red brick facades and a red tiled roof with well-proportioned dormer windows. The proposed extension would replicate this form for the most part and respect the appearance of the dwelling, with the exception of timber cladding to the front facing elevation of the extension to add visual interest without appearing visually dominant over the existing front elevation.

12. The site lies with the Mid Nottinghamshire Farmlands Landscape Policy Zone MN PZ 34 Hockerton Village Farmlands¹, described by the Council as a landscape of moderate sensitivity characterised by very gently undulating and rounded topography; medium distance views to frequently wooded skylines, although often enclosed by hedgerows and woodland. The policy is to conserve historic field patterns and hedgerows by limiting any new development within historic closed boundaries and to areas around specific settlements.
13. The Council raises concern regarding the effect of the proposal on views from the countryside to the rear of the site in particular. However, I observed that the site is not subject to long range views from the rear due to the tree cover. In any event, the site is already occupied by a number of outbuildings in addition to the dwelling, and even if glimpsed from a surrounding vantage point, or from the road by passing motorists, the extension would not appear as an isolated or excessive form of development, but as an integral element of an established rural dwelling. The extension would not otherwise have a harmful effect on key features of the wider landscape character area such as hedgerows, field pattern or use of non-vernacular building styles.
14. The Council refers in evidence to an appeal decision from around 2014 relating on an ostensibly similar proposal, but neither the decision itself nor any particulars of the proposal have been put to me in evidence. However, this appeal relates to a different site and therefore the circumstances are unlikely to be wholly consistent with that of the present scheme, which I have determined on its own planning merits and the site-specific evidence before me.
15. For these reasons, therefore, I conclude that the proposal would represent an acceptable extension to the host dwelling that would preserve the character and appearance of the area, in accordance with the aforementioned requirements of Core Policy 9 of the ACS, Policies DM5 and DM6 of the ADM, the guidance of the HDSPD and the aims of the Framework.

Other Matters

16. The proposal was not refused on the basis of harm to the living conditions of neighbouring occupants or highway safety, and on the evidence before me, I have no reasons to conclude otherwise in these matters.

Conclusion

17. I have found on the main issue that the proposal accords with the development plan, and there are no other material considerations indicating permission should nevertheless be withheld. Therefore, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed, subject to conditions requiring development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans, to provide certainty, and requiring materials to match those specified on the proposed plans, to ensure a satisfactory appearance.

K. Savage

INSPECTOR

¹ As set out in the Newark and Sherwood Landscape Character Assessment SPD (December 2013)