



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: 2nd April 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W3005/D/25/3359017

53 Montague Road, Hucknall, Nottinghamshire NG15 7DT

- 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 Clifton against the decision of Ashfield District Council.
- The application reference is V/2024/0511.
- The development proposed is a two storey side extension, loft conversion with rear dormer.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two storey side extension and loft conversion with rear dormer, at 53 Montague Road, Hucknall, Nottinghamshire NG15 7DT in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref V/2024/0511, and subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing numbers Site Location Plan (Colour); Site Location Plan (Black and White); 24-2722-1v2 (Existing Elevations & Floor Plans and Proposed Block Plan; 24-2722-2v2 (Proposed Elevations, Floor & Section Plans).
 - 3) The external materials of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used on the existing dwelling.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on parking in the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is located on a long, straight residential road with terraced dwellings to both sides that terminates in a dead end for vehicular traffic. The proposed extension would increase the size of the dwelling from three to five bedrooms. The Council, having regard to the Nottinghamshire Highway Design Guide (HDG), has assessed the proposal as being equivalent to six bedrooms on the basis that the proposed dressing area to the master bedroom is large enough to be a bedroom in its own right. However, the Residential Car Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document (2014) (the Parking SPD) sets out that dwellings with 4 or more bedrooms should have 3 spaces per unit, so the parking requirement is the same whether the dwelling has five or six bedrooms.
4. The proposal would infill space to the side of the dwelling, with a first floor addition created above an undercroft leading through to the rear of the site. The proposal would leave a space to the front of the extension that would be significantly shorter

and narrower than the standards for driveways set out in the HDG, namely 3.6 metres in width (where the drive extends to the side of the dwelling) and 5.5 metres in depth. As such, if used as a parking space, it would result in the vehicle overhanging the footway, posing a hazard to pedestrians. The proposed undercroft would also narrow the existing side passage further, to as little as 1.84 metres wide, preventing safe access for vehicles to the rear. As such, no suitable off-street parking would be provided.

5. However, the existing arrangement must also be considered. The Council states that the existing three bedroom dwelling is compliant with the SPD standard of two spaces as one vehicle can be parked to the existing front driveway, and another could be parked at the rear of the site. However, I saw on site that the driveway was blocked off by a timber gate a short distance in from the front elevation, with the area in front used for storage of bins. The plans also indicate that the existing drive is less than 2.5 metres wide, with no clear measurement given for its depth. Therefore, even if the space is nominally capable of accommodating a car, it appeared unsuitable for such purposes in practice due to its short depth and narrow width. The appellant also points to the neighbouring occupant at No 51 having a legal right of access via the driveway and that it cannot be blocked by a vehicle. However, I have no evidence to confirm or refute that. This aside, the gate clearly prevents access by vehicles to the rear of the site and my observations were of a site that does not provide any functional off-street parking.
6. Thus, whilst the proposal would fail to provide parking to the SPD standard, the existing dwelling does not provide any off-street parking that meets these same standards, nor can it given the physical constraints of the site. Existing residents are therefore already likely to park on the street, in common with most other residents of Montague Road, who overwhelmingly live in terraced dwellings with no possibility of providing off-street parking. Only a small number of dwellings along the street have side undercrofts or garages, but these appeared similarly narrow in width and constrained as parking spaces. Therefore, whilst it is clear that the proposed dimensions of the front drive area and the undercroft would be even smaller than the existing situation, I am not persuaded that the proposal would in actuality reduce the level of suitable off-street parking available on site.
7. Moreover, although the Council refers to the proposal as leading to intensification of on-street parking on Montague Road, there is no substantive evidence before me quantifying existing levels of parking demand, or demonstrating that the proposal would result in parking pressure exceeding a saturation level. I saw a considerable amount of parking on street at my visit as well as gaps where parking was possible, and I appreciate this was but a snapshot and that demand is likely to increase in the evening and at weekends when residents are more likely to be at home. However, the street is also not subject to parking restrictions which would suggest demand was at unsustainable levels.
8. Moreover, the proposal would add additional bedrooms to accommodate the appellant's existing family rather than create a separate new dwelling. I have no evidence to suggest the increased number of bedrooms would lead to a corresponding increase in the number of vehicles associated with the property, given the use is and would remain as a single family home. The site is also located close to the centre of Hucknall in a sustainable location where shops and public transport links can be easily accessed on foot. It is reasonable to consider that these factors would have an effect of lowering the rate of car ownership in the

immediate area and limiting the likelihood of the proposal generating additional parking demand.

9. Overall, given the particular site circumstances, and notwithstanding the guidance of the Parking SPD, I conclude that the proposal would not lead to a material intensification in parking demand on Montague Road or otherwise prejudice highway safety. No conflict therefore arises with Policies ST1 and HG7 of the Ashfield Local Plan Review (November 2002) which require that development does not adversely affect highway safety, or the capacity of the transport system.

Other Matters

10. The Council did not refuse permission in respect of the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area. The extension would infill to the side of the dwelling in matching materials, closing an existing gap but effectively replicating the prevailing terraced character, which includes several similar undercrofts. The roof extension would be located to the rear, away from public view and would not upset the consistent overall scale and form of the street scene. Consequently, the character and appearance of the area would be preserved.
11. The Council did not refuse permission in terms of neighbours' living conditions. The side extension would not extend beyond the front or rear elevations, and so would not have an overbearing effect on neighbouring occupants. Windows to the rear elevation would be sufficiently distant from neighbours behind to prevent harmful overlooking. I find no harm would arise in these respects.

Conclusion

12. I conclude that the proposal would accord with the development plan, taken as a whole, and there are no material considerations which indicate that permission should nevertheless be withheld. Therefore, the appeal should be allowed, subject to a condition requiring development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans, to provide certainty. A condition requiring materials to match the existing building is also necessary to ensure a satisfactory appearance.

K Savage

INSPECTOR