



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 March 2025

by K Savage BA(Hons) MPlan MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 31 March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/N3020/D/25/3358915

19 Silverwood Avenue, Ravenshead, Nottinghamshire NG15 9BU

- 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 Robbie Papan against the decision of Gedling Borough Council.
 - The application reference is 2024/0585.
 - The development proposed is a double storey front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. Silverwood Avenue is a residential street of detached dormer bungalows and two storey dwellings. The southern side, which includes the appeal site, has short groups of dwellings with slight variations in form and building line, but the overall pattern is still strongly linear and suburban in character.
4. No 19 is a detached, two storey dwelling forming part of a group from Nos 17 to 25 that is similar in scale, building line and overall form, with some differences in materials and the design of front porches. The dwelling has a full width, porch canopy projecting from the front elevation. The proposal is described as a two storey extension, but would in fact replace the canopy with a full width, first floor addition of some 2.86 metres in depth suspended on pillars above a void at ground floor level, with a separate dual-pitched roof and gable feature.
5. Within the street scene, front extensions are generally single storey in height and shallow in depth, forming ancillary additions that preserve the original form and scale of the dwellings. In contrast, the introduction of an elevated structure suspended above a void would be a wholly uncharacteristic design that would bear no relation to the scale and form of neighbouring dwellings. It would not form a subservient or proportionate addition but would physically and visually dominate the front of the building. It would significantly change its overall shape, scale and appearance, undermining legibility of the original dwelling and creating a highly conspicuous interruption to the consistency of the immediate group of dwellings.
6. The adverse impact of the extension would be compounded by the poor design. The elevated, high level massing would create a top-heavy, overbearing structure that would undermine the natural hierarchy of the building, including by relegating the front entrance door to a recessed position underneath it. The separate pitched roof and visible support pillars would also exacerbate the appearance of the

extension as a structure not designed to complement or integrate with the existing dwelling, but one tacked on to the front elevation in a crude and jarring manner.

7. I accept that the building line to this side of the street varies slightly, and the extension would not be the furthest forward overall, but this would not tangibly reduce its visual impact, as the street is open in character and the dominant, high level massing would be clearly visible in vistas from both directions and would appear wholly uncharacteristic of the street scene.
8. I noted other dwellings in the street referred to in evidence. No 3 has extended out at two storeys to the front but from ground level in a typical manner. It also aligns with the front of No 1 next door and does not project conspicuously beyond its neighbours. A few dwellings have changed to a rendered finish, but they have not extended in a manner equivalent to the appeal scheme or significantly altered the character of the area. As such, these examples are not comparable to the appeal scheme and they do not alter my considerations on the proposal.
9. I am also not persuaded that the proposal would represent a 'positive contrast' to an unremarkable streetscape. The dwellings may not be adventurous in design, but they exemplify typical 20th century suburban architecture, the positivity of which lies largely in their consistency of scale and design creating rhythmic streetscapes. Rather than elevating the design quality of the street above the local vernacular, the proposal would introduce a jarring and visually dominant addition that would fail to have regard to its surroundings. In these respects, the proposal would not represent the good design and innovation advocated by the Framework.
10. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposal would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the area, contrary to Policy 10 of the Gedling Borough Council Aligned Core Strategy (September 2014) which sets out that development will be assessed in terms of structure, texture and grain including street patterns, plot sizes, orientation and positioning of buildings and the layout of space; and Policy LPD43 of the Local Planning Document (July 2018) which supports extensions where the appearance of the proposal is in keeping with surrounding character in terms of height, built form and general design.

Other Matters

11. The proposal is stated to provide additional living space for the appellant's family. However, the plans show two bedrooms being enlarged, and an en-suite provided, but no additional bedrooms or living space would be created. This would represent a private benefit to the appellant of very limited weight.
12. The proposal was not refused in terms of the effects on neighbours' living conditions or highway safety. I have no reasons to conclude otherwise, but an absence of harm means these are neutral factors in the planning balance.

Conclusion

13. The proposal would result in conflict with the development plan, taken as a whole. Other material considerations, namely very limited economic and social benefits of upgrading a single dwelling within the housing stock, do not outweigh this conflict. Therefore, the appeal should be dismissed.

K. Savage INSPECTOR