



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 December 2024

by **A Hartley LLB (Hons) Solicitor MBA**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 January 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/B3040/D/24/3352377

2 Willoughby Road, West Bridgford, Nottingham, Nottinghamshire NG2 6EZ

- 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 Ben Thompson against the decision of Rushcliffe Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 23/02325/FUL.
 - The development proposed is for a two storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) has been updated since the appeal representations were made. However, as the revisions do not affect the matters under consideration in this appeal it was not considered necessary to seek further comment.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character or appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is one half of a two-storey semi-detached dwelling located in a prominent position at the corner of Willoughby Road and Exeter Road. The appeal property has a rear dormer extension and a hipped roof single storey rear extension that wraps around part of the side gable elevation facing Exeter Road. There is a close boarded fence of approximately 1.8 metres to the side boundary with Exeter Road.
5. The surrounding area is characterised by similar semi-detached dwellings, and along Exeter Road, buildings are set back from the highway, resulting in a recognisable building line at two storey level that contributes positively to the character of the area.
6. The appeal proposal would introduce a two-storey side extension, built up to the side boundary with Exeter Road. It would include a reduced ridge height to that of the host dwelling, with dormer, a half hip roof detail and a set back from the front elevation, all in accord with the Rushcliffe Residential Design Guide Supplementary

Planning Document (2009) (SPD). However, the appeal proposal is not set back in from the side boundary. The SPD refers to a set back of a minimum of 900mm from the side boundary and where gaps between buildings are more spacious within the street scene it requires a greater distance. This element of the proposal would disrupt the evident building line along Exeter Road and being in such a prominent corner position at the junction, would appear incongruous in the street scene.

7. By virtue of the prominent corner site and the position directly abutting the side boundary with the highway, the extension would be perceived as bulky and dominant. I do not find that the proposed blind windows and half hip roof detail would be sufficient to mitigate the dominance. Consequently, the appeal proposal would not appear as a subordinate addition to the host dwelling, particularly when viewed from Exeter Road.
8. My attention has been drawn to the planning history of the site, most notably an extant planning permission granted in 2016 for a two-storey side extension.¹ The planning permission allows a side extension of similar height and design. However, in that case it would be set back from the side boundary by approximately 1.2 metres and thus would not introduce the level of harm to the building line that would be caused by the appeal proposal and would be smaller in terms of mass. I have attached little weight to the extant permission as it differs in these material respects to the appeal proposal.
9. My attention has also been drawn to three planning applications for two storey side extensions that have been refused by the Council.² Whilst each proposal is different in scale and design, all would abut the side boundary (at odds with the SPD) and disrupt the Exeter Road building line. I have attached some weight to the consistent approach taken in these decisions in relation to maintaining a separation distance from the side boundary.
10. Overall, I find that the proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area by virtue of its massing and dominance that fails to take account of both the Exeter Road building line and the existing design of the host dwelling.
11. Consequently, the appeal proposal conflicts with Policy 10 of the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy (2014), Policy 1 of the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies (2019), the SPD and the Framework, all of which seek high quality design appropriate to its context.

Other Matters

12. In reaching my decision I have had regard to the fact that since the extant planning permission in 2016 there was a change in the relevant development plan but that the content in relation to design policy is not materially different.

Conclusion

13. For the above reasons, having regard to all representations made, I conclude that the proposal conflicts with the development plan as a whole and with the provisions of the Framework. There are no material considerations that would justify a

¹ 15/03501/FUL

² 21/01851/FUL, 22/00272/FUL, 23/01443/FUL

decision other than one in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, the appeal should be dismissed.

A Hartley

INSPECTOR