



Appeal Decision

Site visit carried out on 10 December 2024

by Mrs J A Vyse DipTP MRTPI DipPBM

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 December 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/A3010/D/24/3353333

145 Windsor Road, Carlton in Lindrick, Notts S81 9DH

- 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 Cunliffe against the decision of Bassetlaw District Council.
 - The application No is 24/00591/HSE.
 - The development proposed comprises a two-storey front extension, a two-storey rear extension and a single storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. For the reasons that follow, the appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The Council takes no issue with the design or principle of the rear and side extensions proposed, and raises no concerns in relation to any impacts on the living conditions of adjoining occupiers through loss of privacy, excessive overshadowing or overbearing impact. From what I saw during my site visit, which included access to the rear of the property, I have no reason to disagree. The Council does take issue, however, with the proposed two-storey extension to the front. In light of that, the main issue in this case relates to the effect of the proposed two-storey front extension on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Decision

3. Windsor Road is a spacious residential street within a large housing estate. The appeal property fronts onto the southern side of the road, within a long run of detached dwellings of similar, although not identical design. All are characterised however, by their homogenous roofs, with the ridge running parallel to the road, with gable ends and an unbroken eaves line. The long views along this side of the road, in both directions, are characterised by the gabled side ends of the properties and the uninterrupted roof lines, with all the roof planes sloping down towards the street with unbroken eaves lines. The overall uniformity of the properties, including the roofscape, creates an architectural rhythm that is a defining feature of the street scene here.
4. When considered in isolation, I consider the proposed design to be acceptable. In this case, however, context is everything. The extension would introduce a large, two-storey gable addition projecting to the front of the property, the ridge to which would tie in with the ridge of the existing house. When seen in profile in either direction along the road, it would be seen in abrupt and jarring contrast to the prevailing roofscape, interrupting the established rhythm of the street, with consequent harm to the character and appearance of the area.

5. I recognise that the opposite side of Windsor Road has a much more varied character and appearance than the southern side, including occasional pairs of dwellings that sit gable end on to the road, interspersed with side roads and dwellings of similar design to No 145. However, it is the long run of properties on the southern side that provide the immediate context for assessment of the development proposed.
6. The harm that I have found as a consequence of the development proposed brings the development into conflict with policy ST33 of the Bassetlaw Local Plan, policy 8 of the Carlton in Lindrick Neighbourhood Plan and paragraphs 131 and 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework,¹ which broadly seek to protect and enhance the built environment and secure high quality development of a design which responds appropriately and sympathetically to the character and appearance of the locality.
7. I have given consideration as to whether a split decision might be appropriate in this case, allowing those elements of the proposal to which the Council has no objection, but refusing the front dormer. However, it is not clear to me that the front extension is clearly severable from the rest of the scheme. There could be implications, for example, for the internal layout which might make the scheme unworkable. Consequently, a split decision is not appropriate in this instance.
8. For the reasons set out above, I therefore conclude that the appeal should not succeed.

Jennifer A Vyse
INSPECTOR

¹ The officer's report refers to paragraphs 131 and 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework. Although a revised version of the Framework was issued in December 2024, subsequent to the decision of the Council, the text of the cited paragraph has not changed.