



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 October 2025

by **K Winnard LL.B Hons Solicitor**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 31 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/P3040/D/25/3373312

5 Burnside Grove, Tollerton, Nottinghamshire NG12 4ET

- 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 Daniel Collier against the decision of Rushcliffe Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00910/FUL.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side and part single storey front and rear extensions including addition of new rear roof dormer and decking.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in the appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and area

Reasons

3. The appeal property, No 5 Burnside Grove, (No 5) is a detached “chalet style” bungalow, set back from the highway within a residential area. In this part of Burnside Grove, the dwellings, of varying appearance, are set well back from the highway behind enclosed front gardens and wide grass verges, forming a distinct and attractive street frontage which contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area in general.
4. No 5 is not particularly dominant in the streetscene, and the proposal involves the construction of a two-storey side and part single storey front and rear extensions, including the addition of a new rear roof dormer and decking. As a result of the scheme, the depth and height of the host property would be increased. Due to the extent of its projection, width, and overall scale and massing, the proposal would be a substantial extension to the front of the property. It would be an incongruous addition, out of scale and character with the existing property, and would have a detrimental visual impact in the immediate area. The proposed front gable would become the most prominent and characteristic feature of the dwelling, and as such would fail to respect the established building line and form as required within the Rushcliffe Design Code (Design Code) (adopted September 2025). I therefore find that the enlarged dwelling would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area.

5. The existing front extension to the property is of poor architectural quality, and I acknowledge that the proposed extension has been designed to reflect elements of a chalet type bungalow, and to enhance the present dwelling. I note too that there would be no concerns in relation to any terracing impact of the proposal. Notwithstanding these factors, they do little to reduce the dominance of the extension on the front elevation. The appellant specifically draws my attention to the numerical increases in property footprint. However, in my view these are substantial increases which would increase the mass of the dwelling significantly. Notwithstanding the variety in appearance of the dwellings on Burnside Grove, they would alter the existing dwelling to the detriment of the balance of the streetscene. This would be at odds with guidance contained within the Design Code.
6. There are variations to the front of properties close to the appeal site and the appellant makes specific reference to the extent of additions at Nos 44 and 54 Burnside Grove. I noted these properties on my site visit. I do not know the circumstances in which these extensions were permitted, and I did not find them to be entirely comparable with regard to the overall proposed design and their siting on a different part of Burnside Grove. My attention was also drawn to a development at 41 Tollerton Lane. Whilst this would appear to be a remodelling of the dwelling, I note that its design would be relatively symmetrical with a central two storey gable. Further, it is sited on a road where the pattern of development differs from that found on Burnside Grove. I therefore cannot draw any direct comparisons from these other properties with the proposal which would weigh in its favour, and the presence of these other examples and variations in design do not justify the harm I have identified.
7. The Council has not raised any concerns in regard to the amenity of the occupiers of neighbouring properties and, having regard to the juxtaposition of the dwellings, I see no reason to disagree with this view. I do not consider the decision notice to be contradictory in terms of the statement made to undue privacy or overbearing issues. These issues are assessed within the officer report and not stated as a basis for refusal in the decision notice, which appears to reference the whole of criterion 4 rather than the relevant part.
8. I note no concerns have been raised in relation to highway or biodiversity issues. However, the absence of harm in all of the above respects does not weigh in favour of the scheme. Further, in reaching my decision I have had regard to references within the Framework which support the proposal including the sustainable location of No 5. Whilst I give moderate weight to the provisions cited in support, they do not outweigh the harm I have identified above in respect of the proposal.
9. I therefore find that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area. The proposal would therefore be contrary to criterion 4 of Policy 1 of the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2 (Land and Planning Policies) which require, amongst other matters, development to be sympathetic to the character and appearance of neighbouring buildings and the surrounding area. It would also be contrary to guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks to promote development sympathetic to local character and to guidance contained within the Design Code in relation to the design of extensions.

Other Matter

10. I note the appellant's reference to the Council's handling of the application, but this is not a matter before me or one which alters my findings.

Conclusion

11. Accordingly, for the reasons given, I hereby dismiss the appeal.

K Winnard

INSPECTOR