



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 February 2025

By S. Hartley BA (Hons) Dist.TP (Manc) DMS MRTPI MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 03 March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/J3015/D/25/3358332

268 Derby Road, Bramcote, Nottinghamshire, NG9 3JN

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).
 - The appeal is made by Yinfei Yin against the decision of Broxtowe Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/00558/FUL
 - The development proposed is the construction of a single storey rear and front extension, a two-storey side extension, and the construction of a detached outbuilding in the rear garden.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for the construction of a single storey rear and front extension, a two-storey side extension, and the construction of a detached outbuilding in the rear garden at 268, Derby Road, Bramcote, Nottinghamshire, NG9 3JN in accordance with the terms of the application Ref:24/00558/FUL, subject to the following condition: -

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:- Location Plan; Site Layout and Block Plan (Drawing Number D301); Proposed Floor Plans - (Drawing Number D102 Rev A); Existing and Proposed Elevations - (Drawing Number D201 Rev A); Existing and Proposed Elevations - (Drawing Number D202 Rev A); Existing and Proposed Elevations - (Drawing Number D203 Rev A) and Proposed Garden Room - (Drawing Number D204 Rev A).

Procedural Matters

2. The National Planning Policy Framework was revised in December 2024 and amended on 7 February 2025 (the Framework) to correct cross references from footnotes 7 and 8, and to amend the end of the first sentence of paragraph 155 to make its intent clear. The 2025 Framework has not materially changed in terms of the identified main issues below and, therefore, it has not been necessary for me to seek comments from the main parties in respect of the changes.
3. The appeal is made retrospectively for development already constructed.

The proposed development and the main Issue

4. In 2022, planning permission was granted for single storey front and rear extensions, a detached outbuilding and for a two-storey side extension, the latter with a double pitched roof¹. Construction work began. However, it was found that the ridge of the two-storey side extension would exceed the ridge of the host

¹ 22/00628/FUL

property by approximately 50 cms, and to maintain the subservience of the side extension, it was decided to replace the triangular tip of the extension's double pitched roof by a flat roof. Thus, the side extension now has a double pitched roof, but with a flat top to it.

5. The local planning authority (LPA) raises no objection to all other aspects of the constructed development, and I have no reason to disagree. Therefore, the main issue is the effect of the flat top to the two-storey side extension upon the character and appearance of the building and the area.

Reasons

6. The appeal property is a detached, two-storey dwelling amongst a line of similar properties which have front and rear amenity spaces. The roof to the double pitched side extension runs parallel to Derby Road and when seen from the latter, the flat part of the roof is inconspicuous. The extension appears as a subservient addition to the host property and where the roof line of the extension is no greater than that of the original dwelling. The same applies when viewed from the rear garden of the house. The dwellings along this part of Derby Road are sited close together which obscures any side views of the flat topped extension to the point where it is not noticeable.
7. The pitch of the main part of the roof to the extension is the same as that of the roof to the host dwelling and this minimises to a considerable extent any impact of the flat roof part.
8. While the LPA considers that the flat part of the roof introduces an incongruous and unacceptable feature, I was able to see on my site visit that the immediate area has varying roof designs, several with differing appendages. That at No. 264 Derby Road and to which the appellant refers, while not the exact same as that for the appeal proposal, has similarities to it with a flattened top to pitched sides.
9. When considering the limited scale of the flat part to the roof, its limited visibility, and the variations to adjoining roof designs, I consider that it would not adversely affect the character and appearance of the dwelling or that of the area. Therefore, I conclude that the development accords with Policy 10 of the Broxtowe Aligned Core Strategy (2014) which requires development to have regard to its local context, and with Policy 17 of the Broxtowe Part 2 Local Plan (2019) which requires development to integrate into its surroundings. It conforms to chapter 12 of the Framework which requires the same.

Conditions

10. I have imposed a condition relating to the approved plans, for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of certainty.

Conclusion

11. For the above reasons, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

S. Hartley

INSPECTOR