



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 January 2024

by **D Cleary MTCP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17th February 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/J3015/D/24/3355116

12 Kenilworth Road, Beeston, Nottinghamshire NG9 2HX

- 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 & Mrs Dalton against the decision of Broxtowe Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/00430/FUL.
 - The development proposed is a loft conversion with rear dormer and raised ridge.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a loft conversion with rear dormer and raised ridge at 12 Kenilworth Road, Beeston, Nottinghamshire NG9 2HX in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24/00430/FUL, and 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 development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans referenced:

982-01 - Existing Plans

982-02 Rev A – Existing Elevations

982-03 Rev C – Proposed Plans

982-04 Rev B – Proposed Elevations

3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Preliminary Matters

2. 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

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

Reasons

4. The appeal dwelling is a two-storey, semi-detached property with dual pitched roof. The front elevation of the dwelling and its semi-detached pairing, No.10 Kenilworth Road (No.10), each have a two-storey bay window with small gable roof above, arched detailing over the front door, and an oriel window at first floor level. Chimneys are positioned centrally between the two properties, one on the front roof slope and a further one on the rear roof slope. These architectural features of the front façade of the two properties result in a visually well-balanced pairing.
5. Kenilworth Road is a cul-de-sac which comprises a number of two-storey semi-detached properties with either hipped or standard gable roofs. Two-storey bay windows with gable above, along with centrally positioned chimneys are a consistent characteristic of the semi-detached properties. There are a number of large box dormers positioned on the rear roof slopes of surrounding dwellings. The appeal dwelling and No.10 are set back slightly behind the adjacent pairing of No.14 and No.16 Kenilworth Road (No.14 and No.16). No.14 and No.16 are, in turn, slightly set back from No.18 and No.20 Kenilworth Road.
6. The slight stagger in the building line within the street, along with the height and position of the front gables and chimneys, means that the roof of the appeal dwelling is largely obscured in views along Kenilworth Road. Therefore, when approaching along Kenilworth Road the roof of the appeal dwelling is not visually prominent. Furthermore, these characteristics on this part of the street means that there is not a visibly continuous ridge line. The scheme proposes only a modest raising of the ridgeline and therefore would not result in a significant upward projection. Given the street characteristics that I have identified above, the roof of the appeal dwelling would remain largely obscured in views and, as such, would not be prominent.
7. From the front of the property, the increase in ridge height would be more noticeable. However, the central position of the chimneys visually break the continuity of the ridgeline of the pairing. The increase in height is limited and would not protrude above the chimneys. The chimney would ensure that the subtle difference in ridge heights, when viewed from the front, could be provided without visually disrupting the roof form or result in significant imbalance between the properties. Furthermore, the main architectural features to the front façade of the pairing would remain unaltered. The modest increase in height proposed would not disrupt this strong sense of symmetry and balance between the two properties.
8. The proposed rear dormer would be a large addition to the rear roof slope, although it would be set away from the eaves, chimney and side elevation. These off sets would mean that the original roof form could be visually identified and would be sufficient to ensure that the roof would not be wholly subsumed by the dormer. The dormer would be glimpsed from Kenilworth Road through the gap between the dwelling and No.14. However, its rear siting, and close spacing with No.14 would ensure that it would not appear visually prominent from the street. From the private gardens to the rear, the scale of the dormer would be more noticeable. However, there are other dormers of similar scale within the surrounding roof scape and, as such, the dormer would be viewed in this existing context and would not appear out of place or incongruous to the area.

9. For the above reasons, I conclude that the development would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the building and surrounding area. Therefore, the development complies with Policy 17 of the Broxtowe Borough Council Part 2 Local Plan 2018-2028 (2019) and Policy 10 of the Greater Nottingham Aligned Core Strategies Part 1 Local Plan (2014). Together, amongst other things, these seek to deliver high-quality design in new development which integrates into its surroundings, providing a positive contribution, while having regard to townscape characteristics.

Conditions

10. I have imposed standard conditions relating to the commencement of development, and to require compliance with the submitted plans for certainty. I have also attached a condition for materials to match the existing property which is necessary in the interest of the character and appearance of the building and area.

Conclusion

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

D Cleary

INSPECTOR