



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 January 2025

by **D Cleary MTCP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 February 2025

Appeal Ref: APPW3005/D/24/3348062

6 Dorothy Avenue, Hucknall, Nottinghamshire NG15 8DL

- 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 Wayne Holland against the decision of Ashfield District Council.
 - The application Ref is V/2024/0210.
 - The development proposed is described as two storey extensions to side and rear elevations and render to existing dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for two storey extensions to side and rear elevations and render to existing dwelling at 6 Dorothy Avenue, Hucknall, Nottinghamshire NG15 8DL in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref V/2024/0210, and subject to the following condition:

1) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans referenced:

6DOAV.PP3/1 – Existing Elevation Views

6DOAV.PP3/2 Rev A – Proposed Elevation Views

6DOAV.PP3/3 Rev A – Existing and Proposed Plan Views

Location Plan (dated 24/04/24)

Preliminary Matters

2. On my site visit I observed that the development subject to the appeal had taken place and was complete. Planning permission is therefore sought retrospectively. While the development is largely in accordance with the plans before me, there is a window within the first floor front elevation of the side extension which is not detailed on the plans. Consequently, I have assessed the appeal development based on the plans provided, as the Council have, rather the development which is in situ.
3. The Government published a revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) on 12 December 2024. Those parts of the Framework most relevant to this appeal have not been amended. As a result, I have not sought submissions on the revised Framework, and I am satisfied that no party's interests have been prejudiced by taking this approach.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the existing building and surrounding area.

Reasons

5. The appeal dwelling is a two-storey, detached property which is located at the end of a small cul-de-sac which spurs off Hayden Lane. The building line of Nos. 2 to 6 Dorothy Avenue is staggered, with the appeal dwelling set behind the front elevation of No.4. The position of the dwelling at the end of the street, along with the staggered building line, means the dwelling is prominently positioned on Dorothy Avenue. The adjacent dwellings, Nos. 2 and 4 Dorothy Avenue, have predominantly rendered front elevations while the dwellings on the opposite side of the street are mainly faced with brickwork. The surrounding area is predominantly residential in character, although the dwelling is located at the edge of the built up area with a large field located beyond its side boundary.
6. The two-storey side/rear extension is positioned behind a single storey side projection. The width of the extension matches that of the single storey side projection, which is narrower than that of the two-storey front façade of the dwelling. Due to its narrower width, the extension does not appear out of proportion with the original dwelling in this regard. The height of the extension is similar to that of the original dwelling, however, the extension is set back by some distance from the front façade. This set-back, together with its narrower width ensures that the similar height of the extension is not prominent from Dorothy Avenue, and does not visually compete with the original dwelling. Therefore, the position and scale of the extension appears as a visually subservient addition to the dwelling.
7. It is noted that the roof pitch of the extension is shallower than the existing main front facing gable. However, the significant set-back of the extension ensures that the slight difference in pitch does not appear overly noticeable to result in an visually incongruous addition. As such, there is an appropriate degree of visual harmony between the extension and the original dwelling. Therefore, I do not consider that the scale or form of the extension to dominate the original dwelling when viewed from Dorothy Avenue.
8. The extension addresses a large field to the side. I note that this land may be scheduled for development, however I have no details of what is proposed for this land. There are some public views across the field towards the appeal dwelling and existing built edge of the settlement. These views are over some distance and the extended dwelling does not appear prominent. Furthermore, the gable roof form of the extension appears harmonious with the surrounding roof scape where gables are prevalent. There are also some views between dwellings, and over gardens, including from Delia Avenue. However, these views are glimpsed and over a distance which means that the extensions do not appear visually prominent.
9. I note the lack of a first floor window to the front elevation, however, as observed above, the position of the extension ensures that it does not appear prominent from Dorothy Avenue. The single storey projection positioned to the front of the extension, is more prominent, and contains a front window. This ground floor window, together with the set-back of the extension, would visually break up this part of the front façade and provide an appropriate degree of interest. As such, the

expanse of elevation without an opening would not be significant. Therefore, a lack of opening at first floor level would not appear visually harmful to the dwelling, nor would it be harmful in views from Dorothy Avenue or the surrounding area. I also acknowledge that there is some variety in the overall design of the windows in the extension. However, those varied design of openings are positioned on the side elevation or to the rear, where they have limited visibility or prominence from the public realm. Therefore, I do not consider the window designs to be harmful to the character of the dwelling or surrounding area.

10. The dwelling is located within a small row of dwellings where rendering is a dominant facing material of the front façade. Furthermore, the dwelling is the last property within the row and is not visually prominent in views along the street. In this context, the rendering of the dwelling does not appear out of character with its surroundings.
11. For the above reasons, I conclude that the development would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the existing building and surrounding area. Therefore, the development complies with Policies ST1 and HG7 of the Ashfield Local Plan Review (2004). Together, amongst other things, these require that development does not adversely affect the character and visual amenity of the area. However, I do not find Policy ST2 to be of specific relevance to the main issue of the appeal.
12. I have also had regard to the advice contained within the Residential Extensions Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2014) (SPD). While there is some deviation from the guidance, for example with regard to window design, the SPD is confirmed as being for guidance purposes only and each application should be considered on its individual merits, as I have done in respect of this appeal.

Conditions

13. As the development has commenced and is substantially complete, it is not necessary to attach the standard time limit or materials condition. However, I have required compliance with the submitted plans as these deviate slightly from the development which has been carried out and these are the ones upon which I have made my decision.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above the appeal should be allowed.

D Cleary

INSPECTOR