



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 April 2025

by Andreea Spataru BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 May 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/J3015/D/25/3360334

76 Wellspring Dale, Stapleford, Nottinghamshire NG9 7EU

- 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 Reka Szarvas against the decision of Broxtowe Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/00745/FUL.
 - The development proposed is described as 'demolish existing garage and construct new garage/garden room along boundary'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. Since the application was determined, a revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published on 12 December 2024. However, as any policies that are material to this decision have not fundamentally changed, I am satisfied that this has not prejudiced any party. I have had regard to the latest version of the Framework in reaching my decision.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site relates to a semi-detached, two-storey dwelling located on the eastern side of Wellspring Dale, in a predominantly residential area. The property has a drive to the side and a garden to the rear. At the time of my site visit the garage shown as 'existing' on the submitted plans was not in place. The set in of the appeal dwelling from the side boundary shared with No 78 Wellspring Dale allows for views towards the rear of the property from Wellspring Dale. Garages are common within the immediate area, and there is generally consistency in their scale and appearance, particularly as they appear proportionate to their host dwellings.
5. The proposed single-storey, flat roofed garage/garden room, which would accommodate several solar panels, would occupy part of the rear garden. It would extend across the northern side boundary of the site, along the full depth of the rear garden, and across a significant part of the rear boundary of the appeal site. In addition to its depth, which would considerably exceed that of the host dwelling,

the garage/garden room would also have a considerable width, particularly towards the rear.

6. Due to a combination of its unusual shape, flat roof, and overall mass and scale, the garage would appear as an incongruous and disproportionate addition. Given its siting, views of it would be available within the street scene and from the surrounding properties. I am unconvinced that matching tiles could be used due to the proposed flat roof, and I have not been provided with detailed evidence in this regard. Nevertheless, the proposed roof style would not be sufficient to make the structure appear proportionate to the host dwelling. Therefore, the garage would be harmful to both the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. This would be irrespective of the appeal site's location outside a conservation area and away from listed buildings.
7. In conclusion, the proposed garage/garden room would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. Thus, it is contrary to Policy 10 of the Aligned Core Strategies Part 1 Local Plan adopted 2014 and Policy 17 of the Broxtowe Borough Council Part 2 Local Plan 2018-2028 adopted 2019, which collectively require developments to integrate well into their surroundings.

Other Matters

8. The appellant considers the proposal represents a sustainable development that would make efficient use of land. I acknowledge the benefits of the proposal for the appellant's family in terms of additional ancillary space. However, the Framework states, at paragraph 131, that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development. Given the harmful impact that the proposal would have on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area, the development fails to achieve the aims of the Framework, and any private benefits do not outweigh the harm identified.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposal would conflict with the development plan and there are no material considerations, including the Framework, that would outweigh that conflict. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

Andreea Spataru

INSPECTOR