



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 January 2024

by Paul Cooper MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5 February 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/B3030/D/23/3325131

14 Fern Close, Southwell NG25 0DB

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant approval required under Schedule 2, Part 1, Class AA of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended)
 - The appeal is made by Mr Bottomley against the decision of Newark & Sherwood District Council.
 - The application Ref 23/00792/HPRIOR, dated 2 May 2023, was refused by notice dated 6 June 2023.
 - The development proposed is householder prior approval for the enlargement of a dwelling by an additional storey. Height of building increased by 2.55m. New height of the building will be 7.05m.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. Schedule 2, Part 1, Class AA of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 as amended (the GPDO), permits, amongst other things, subject to conditions and limitations and in the case of the appeal scheme, development consisting of the enlargement of a dwellinghouse by construction of one additional storey, where the existing dwellinghouse consists of one storey, together with any reasonably necessary engineering operations.
3. The GPDO sets out that the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) can be considered relevant in prior approval cases so far as relevant to the subject matter of the prior approval, as if the application were a planning application.

Main Issue

4. The main issue in this appeal is whether prior approval should be granted, having particular regard to paragraph AA.2 (3)(a)(ii) of the GPDO in relation to the external appearance of the dwellinghouse.

Reasons

5. The locality surrounding the appeal site is residential and is comprised of a mixture of single-storey bungalows and two-storey dwellings with a clear delineation of which type of property is in which area on the street. The appeal property makes up part of a well-balanced group of single-storey bungalows. The bungalows, with some minor exceptions, exhibit consistent heights, similar

roof forms and design. Overall, the bungalows have a cohesive appearance and even rhythm which makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the street.

6. The proposal would add an additional storey to the appeal property, designed with matching features and materials to the existing building. Nonetheless, the addition of the extra storey would create a jarring and discordant change in height in the row of bungalows, which would severely disrupt the harmony of the group and result in a property that would be harmfully at odds with the appearance of the existing dwelling and its immediate surroundings.
7. The change of property type would disrupt the flow and form an incongruous feature which would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area
8. Consequently, the proposal would not add to the overall quality of the area or be sympathetic to the surrounding built environment as required by paragraph 131 of the Framework. Prior approval should, therefore, not be granted having regard to the external appearance of the dwellinghouse.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that Prior Approval should not be granted and, therefore, that the appeal should be dismissed.

Paul Cooper

INSPECTOR