



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 August 2025

by **D J Barnes MBA BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W3005/W/25/3367658

8 Cedar Close, Skegby, Sutton in Ashfield, Nottinghamshire NG17 3FG

- 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 Mikki Joyce against the decision of Ashfield District Council.
 - The application Ref is V/2025/0163.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a single storey side extension and Change of Use to residential and dog grooming business.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. For reasons of precision, the description of development has been adopted from the council's decision notice.

Main Issue

3. It is considered that the main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The proposed development includes the erection of a single storey side extension which would be used, in part, as a dog grooming business by the occupier of the host property. The council has not raised any specific objection to the erection of the proposed extension itself causing unacceptable harm to the host property and the surrounding area. There are no reasons to disagree with the council's assessment.
5. The property is situated within a predominantly residential area and, as claimed by the council, there were no obvious indications of commercial uses associated with other dwellings. The property is also on a road which is not part of a through route and it was observed during the daytime site visit that the number of traffic movements was low.
6. The appellant has clarified that only a small part of the proposed extension would be used for the dog grooming business with the remainder being in domestic use associated with the host property. Further, the proposed use would only occur during the daytime, initially working around current job commitments. There would

also be no employees so a maximum of 5 dogs could be groomed per day. An appointment system would operate with dogs only being dropped-off and collected with the front garden possessing adequate space for off-street parking to occur.

7. It would be possible to impose a condition restricting the hours of operation of any dog grooming business if this appeal succeeded. However, conditions requiring the use of a booking system, restricting the number of employees, limiting the number of dogs being groomed and preventing a potential expansion of the dog grooming use into other parts of the enlarged property would be difficult to enforce. Accordingly, the council's concerns related to the comings and goings of customers, an increase in vehicles visiting the property and the associated change to the character of this dwelling and the surrounding residential area are well founded in this case.
8. For the reasons given, and acknowledging the erection of the extension itself is not objectionable, it is concluded that the proposed development would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area and, as such, it would conflict with Policy ST1 of the Ashfield Local Plan Review. Amongst other matters, this policy only supports development which will not adversely affect the character and amenity of the environment. Accordingly, it is concluded that this appeal should be dismissed.

D J Barnes

INSPECTOR