



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 October 2024

by Elaine Benson BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 October 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/P3040/D/24/3351661

32 Alford Road, West Bridgford, Nottinghamshire NG2 6GJ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Andrew Golding against the decision of Rushcliffe Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/00702/FUL.
 - The development proposed is erection of a two storey side extension and single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for erection of a two storey side extension and single storey rear extension at 32 Alford Road, West Bridgford, Nottinghamshire NG2 6GJ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24/00702/FUL, 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 exterior of the development hereby permitted must be constructed using only the materials specified in the submitted application form. If any alternative materials are proposed to be used, then prior to the development advancing beyond damp proof course level, the details of all alternative external materials must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Borough Council. Thereafter the development must be carried out in accordance with the approved, alternative materials.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Location Plan, 01001, 01002, 02001, 02002, 02006, 02007, 03001, 03003.

Main Issue

2. No objections are raised to the proposed single storey rear extension, nor to the raising of the chimney which is also proposed as part of the development. There are no reasons to disagree. The main issue in this appeal therefore is the effect of the proposed two storey side extension on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The proposed two storey side extension would be set back from the front elevation at ground and first floor level and set down from the main roof ridge. The Council calculates that the width of the side extension would be approximately 44% of the width of the front elevation. It would therefore be subordinate to the original dwelling. The proposed side extension would respect the design, scale, proportions and roof form of the original building and the original dwelling would remain the dominant element. In this regard the proposal would accord with the requirements of the Rushcliffe Residential Design Guide (RRDG).
4. The proposed extension would be close to the boundary and the flank elevation of No 30. Whilst the set in from the building line would not be significant, space would remain between the two neighbouring houses. This space would be visually apparent as the two properties stand at different ground levels. I am satisfied that there would be no visual terracing between them, despite the overhanging eaves of the extension. My conclusion is supported by the extension at the side of No 30 which extends to its boundary with No 28 and does not form a terracing effect with this neighbouring house. The spatial relationship between these two properties is similar to that in the appeal proposal.
5. I conclude that the proposed development would respect the character and visual amenities of the host property and the wider area and would therefore comply with Policy 10 of the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy and Policy 1 of the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies. In summary and of relevance to this appeal, these policies require development to be of high quality and to respect its surroundings. Furthermore, there would be no conflict with the detailed design guidance set out in the RRDG and the design objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework.
6. For the reasons set out above and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is allowed.

Conditions

7. A condition requires the external materials to comply with those specified in the planning application form to safeguard visual amenities. I have included a condition identifying the approved drawings for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

Elaine Benson

INSPECTOR