



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 April 2024 by Andreea Spataru BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

Decision by Mr R Walker BA HONS DIPTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28th May 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/B3030/D/24/3338513

Woodlands, Station Road, Fiskerton, Newark NG25 0UG

- 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 S Sparks against the decision of Newark & Sherwood District Council.
 - The application ref is 23/02059/HOUSE.
 - The development proposed is described as first floor side and front extension over existing garage (retrospective).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for first floor side and front extension over existing garage (retrospective) at Woodlands, Station Road, Fiskerton, Newark NG25 0UG in accordance with the terms of application ref 23/02059/HOUSE.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary matter

3. The appeal dwelling benefits from planning permission¹ for a two-storey side extension, which has not been built entirely according with the approved plans. The development before me seeks to regularise the extension built to the side of the appeal dwelling. Accordingly, I am dealing with the appeal retrospectively.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the development on the street scene in Station Road.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal site relates to a two-storey, semi-detached dwelling, located on the western side of Station Road, within a predominantly residential area. The dwellings located on the western side of Station Road, within proximity of the appeal site, are semi-detached and detached dwellings. Some of them have two-storey side extensions close to their side boundary, including the adjoining dwelling, Honeysuckle Cottage.

¹ LPA ref: 22/02472/HOUSE

6. The first-floor extension projects along most of the depth of the original dwelling, with a minimal set back at the first-floor level from the front elevation. The extension sits next to the side boundary of the site, and it follows the ridge of the original dwelling. In terms of massing and siting, the development differs from the approved extension as it lacks a small set down from the main ridge. In terms of materials, I understand that the roof tiles of the extension aimed to match the colour of the original tiles, and I observed on my site visit that the red colour of the original tiles is noticeable in parts of the roof. Accordingly, I find no issue with the roof materials.
7. The pair of the appeal dwelling has its two-storey side extension set back from the front elevation and set down from the main ridge. The extensions appear to have a similar width, as they both fill in the gap between their host dwelling and side boundary. Accordingly, due to its siting and height, the appeal development appears slightly larger in scale than the adjoining dwelling's extension.
8. Notwithstanding this, whilst a set down would have appeared more subservient to the host dwelling, I find that there are sufficient elements, such as width and depth of the extension, openings size and placement, and matching render, that ensure the extension appears as a proportionate addition to the host dwelling. Having regard to the street scene context, the development does not unbalance the pair of semi-detached dwellings to such a degree that is harmful to their appearance. Thus, the development is not harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the adjoining semi-detached property.
9. Due to the siting of the extensions close to their side boundary, the distance between the pair of semi-detached dwellings located on the western side of Station Road has reduced. Whilst the extension lacks a set down, having regard to the approved scheme where the set down was minimal, I consider that the development does not exacerbate the terracing effect along the street scene.
10. Consequently, the development adequately integrates within its surroundings, and is therefore acceptable for the character and appearance of the street scene. In reaching my conclusion I have taken into account that the appeal site is within proximity of the Fiskerton Conservation Area's boundary, on which it has a neutral effect. Accordingly, it complies with Core Policy 9 of the Amended Core Strategy 2019, Policies DM5, DM6 of the Newark & Sherwood Local development Framework Allocations and Development Management Development Plan Document 2013, Policy FCM5 of the Fiskerton cum Morton Parish Neighbourhood Plan, and the aims of the National Planning Policy Framework, which collectively require that developments respect the design, materials and detailing of the host dwelling and the character of the surrounding area.

Other matter

11. Whilst I acknowledge the Parish Council comments regarding the retrospective nature of the development, I considered the development on its own merits and site specific-circumstances, which in this instance, for the reasons set out above, is acceptable.

Recommendation

12. I have had regard to the Council's suggested conditions in the event that the appeal was allowed. However, given the retrospective nature of the development, and my findings above, I find that no conditions are necessary in this instance.
13. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed.

Andreea Spataru

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

14. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's recommendation and on that basis the appeal is allowed.

Mr R Walker

INSPECTOR