



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: 5th March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/P3040/D/25/3358477

41, Melton Gardens, Edwalton, Nottinghamshire NG12 4BJ

- 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. A. Goodridge against the decision of Rushcliffe Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/01239/FUL
 - The development proposed is a first-floor side extension over an existing garage, and a ground floor front extension for an entrance porch and a new roof over a bay window.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The National Planning Policy Framework was revised in December 2024 and amended on 7 February 2025 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 (the 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.

The Main Issue

3. The local planning authority (LPA) raises no objection to the proposed ground floor front extension, and I have no reason to disagree. The main issue is the effect of the proposed first floor side extension upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is part of a cul-de-sac line of modern, detached, brick built, two-store dwellings which include single story side editions with pitched roofs. They have amenity spaces both to the front and rear, and they are set relatively close to each other.
5. While there are some design differences to the dwellings, the above features give a general unity to them, and which adds positively and distinctively to the character and appearance of the area.
6. The single-story additions, by their more limited heights, provide a spaciousness to the area, allowing views from the fronts of the properties of the sky beyond, and in

some cases, of trees. The spaciousness provided prevents the area having a less attractive terracing effect.

7. The proposal is to erect a first-floor extension to the appeal property above its single-story addition. In so doing, it would adversely detract from the spaciousness of the area to the significant detriment to its character and appearance.
8. Moreover, the proposed extension, by its overall mass and height and its absence of any setback from the host property, would not be subservient to the original dwelling, reducing the spaciousness around it to its significant detriment.
9. The appellant has referred to a first-floor extension at No. 27, Melton Gardens. However, on my site visit, I was able to note a distinctive change to the character and appearance of dwellings to either side of the access road leading into Melton Gardens. No.27 Melton Gardens forms part of the group of properties situated to one side of the access road and which has a different character and appearance to the area within which the appeal site is set.
10. In addition, the appellant has referred to other two-storey developments in other areas where properties are close together. However, there is an absence of single storey side additions in the quoted examples, and they are built to a different design and layout, within areas with different characters and appearances to that within which the appeal property is set.
11. For the above reasons, I do not consider that the examples quoted by the appellant provide a suitable template for the appeal proposal and I have determined the appeal upon its individual merits set within the character and appearance of the immediate area around it.
12. Therefore, I conclude that the proposed development would not accord with policies 1(4) of the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2, or with chapter 12 of the Framework, both of which require development to be of good design which accords with the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

13. There are no material planning considerations that indicate that the application should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, the appeal should be dismissed.

S. Hartley

INSPECTOR