



Appeal Decision

Site visit carried out on 11 November 2025

by **Jennifer Vyse DipTP DipPBM MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 05 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/A3010/D/25/3373854

26 Harewood Avenue, Retford, Nottinghamshire DN22 7PH

- 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 Nadine Ping against the decision of Bassetlaw District Council.
 - The application No is 25/00626/HSE.
 - The development proposed is a single-storey side and rear extension.
-

Decision

1. For the reasons that follow, the appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single-storey side and rear extension at 26 Harewood Avenue, Retford, Nottinghamshire in accordance with the terms of the application, No 25/00626/HSE, subject to the conditions set out in the attached schedule.

Preliminary Matters

2. The grounds of appeal suggest that significantly more built form than is proposed could be achieved through permitted development rights, although it would provide a less cohesive solution. However, no detailed evidence is before me in terms of how any such arrangement might function or appear in elevation, or that such a scheme would necessarily be pursued if this appeal was to fail, such as to provide a fall-back position. Neither, given the nature of the appeal, do I have the Council's comments on any such scheme. I confirm, in this regard, that I have considered the proposal simply on its own merits.

Main Issues

3. The main issues in this case relate to:
 - the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area;
 - its effect on living conditions for adjoining occupiers, having particular regard to outlook, daylight and privacy and;
 - its effect on highway safety.

Reasons for the Decision

Character and Appearance

4. The appeal property comprises a two-storey semi-detached dwelling on the western side of Harewood Avenue, a long residential cul-de-sac. Both it, and the adjacent semi-detached dwelling to the north (No 24) are each separated from their shared boundary by a narrow driveway alongside each property. The respective

driveways lead to a pair of adjoining brick garages within the rear gardens. Although described as a garage, the driveways are too narrow for most modern cars to access those buildings. They are, nevertheless, fairly substantial structures.

5. Nos 26 and 24 benefit from a single storey extension across the rear of each property, with the boundary between the two dwellings (forward of the garages) comprising close boarded fencing roughly 1.5m in height.
6. The proposed extension would extend slightly further back than the existing garage and would be wider. A narrower element would connect this part of the extension to the existing house, extending a short distance alongside the house, between the house and the boundary with No 24. Whilst appearing sizeable in plan form, the extension would effectively replace the existing garage building with a slightly larger building that would link to the house.
7. The extension is shown as having a flat roof with a low parapet wall. The rear of the property is not readily visible in public views. Only that part between the house and the shared boundary with No 24 would be seen from the street. It would be in materials to match the host property, set well back into the site, coming no further forward than the rear wall of the original dwelling. From the street, it would be seen as a modest, unobtrusive addition to the property, with no harm to the established character and appearance of the area. I find no conflict, in this regard, with policy ST33 of the Bassetlaw Local Plan, section 3.5 of the Council's Successful Places SPD, or paragraph 139 of the National Planning Policy Framework which, together seek to protect the character and appearance of an area and its sense of place.
8. In terms of visibility from neighbouring properties, a concern of the Council in relation to character and appearance, that is a matter that relates more to living conditions for residents in terms of their outlook, rather than character and appearance generally.

Living Conditions

9. Whilst the existing garage within the rear garden of No 24 would screen much of the proposed extension, that section in front of the garage would extend along the shared boundary for a distance of roughly 6 metres, with an overall height of around 3.3m.¹ However, the relationship of No 24 to the appeal site means that most of this part of the extension would lie between the two properties, rather than projecting to the rear of No 24, with the existing garage within the curtilage of No 24 channelling views out from rear facing ground floor windows down the garden, rather than affording oblique views across the rear curtilage of No 26.
10. I consider the separation of No 24 from the shared boundary, combined with the presence of their own detached garage within the rear garden, to be sufficient to ensure that the development proposed would not be seen as overbearing in terms of outlook for the adjoining occupiers. In terms of shadowing, No 26 lies to the south/southwest of No 24. Accordingly, the existing detached garage buildings will already cast shadows across the rear ground floor windows to No 24. No evidence is before me in this regard, to demonstrate that the proposed extension, even

¹ All the measurements referred to here are based on the figures set out in the officer's report, which are not contested by the appellant.

though it would be slightly taller than the garages, would result in any material change in terms of shadowing of the adjacent property.

11. The submitted plans show a bathroom window within the side elevation of the proposed extension, on the shared boundary. Whilst not an ideal arrangement, the window would be obscure glazed, with no opening light below 1.7m, matters that could be secured by condition were the appeal to succeed. That would be sufficient, in my view, to protect the privacy of the adjoining occupiers (and the occupiers of No 26). Whilst the Council also refers to the potential for odours, any opening light would be small, as shown on the plans. I am not persuaded in this regard, that the arrangement would be likely to result in significant odour problems.
12. In terms of outlook for occupiers of other properties around the appeal site, the proposal relates to a single storey extension, only marginally higher than and in a similar position to the existing garage building. I recognise that it would have a flat roof, whereas the existing rear extension to No 26 has a mono-pitch roof, but flat roofs are not unusual on rear extensions, not least because the design helps to keep the overall height down. It would also be in brick to match the host dwelling. I do not find the proposed arrangement to be unsightly or jarring in this regard. Moreover, the extension would be sufficiently distant from other neighbouring properties such that it would not be seen as unduly prominent or overbearing.
13. I am content therefore, that there would be no conflict with policy 46 of the Local Plan, section 3.11.11 of the SPD or paragraph 135 of the Framework, which together and among other things, seek to protect the amenity of residents in terms of their living conditions.

Highway Safety

14. At present, there is space for one car to be parked on-site at the front of the property, with unrestricted parking available on the street. The development proposed would create an additional bedroom, resulting in a four-bedroom property which, the Council contends, gives rise to a need for two additional parking spaces, although it is not clear where that figure derives from, how it has been calculated, nor whether it is a maximum or minimum requirement. I am mindful, in this regard, that policy ST53 of the Local Plan simply requires, among other things, that development should not compromise the free flow of traffic on the public highway. It does not set out any parking standards.
15. Although on-street parking was readily available at the time of my visit in the late afternoon, the Council advises that a high number of vehicles park on the road. I have no reason to doubt, in this regard, that whilst numerous properties do have on-site parking, there may be greater demand for on-street spaces in the evenings and at weekends. Even so, the officer's report also confirms that two additional vehicles could potentially be accommodated along the Avenue, although it is maintained that that would, together with existing on-street parking, be likely to obstruct the free-flow of traffic, posing particular challenges for emergency vehicles at the cul-de-sac end of the street.
16. Paragraph 116 of the National Planning Policy Framework confirms that development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an '*unacceptable impact on highway safety*'. The development proposed would not reduce the existing on-site provision, and no substantiated evidence is before me in this case to demonstrate that existing on-street parking currently

causes difficulties for emergency vehicles or otherwise presents a danger in terms of highway safety. All told, I have no reason to suppose that the bedroom extension proposed would be likely to result in a material increase in demand for on-street parking spaces such that it would obstruct the free-flow of traffic along the Avenue, especially emergency vehicles, or that there would otherwise be an unacceptable impact on highway safety. I am particularly mindful, in this regard, that there is no objection from the Highway Authority in support of the Council's position. I find no conflict, in this regard with policy ST53 of the Local Plan, or with paragraphs 115 and 116 of the Framework, which together and among other things seek to protect such interests.

Conclusion

17. I have found no material harm in terms of the character and appearance of the area, nor in terms of living conditions for neighbouring occupiers. I have also found no unacceptable impact in terms of highway safety as a consequence of the potential for the development to increase demand for on-street parking. On balance, therefore, for the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal should succeed.
18. In addition to the standard time limit on commencement of development (1), a condition specifying the relevant plans is required in order to create certainty for all parties (2). A condition to ensure that the external materials match those on the existing house is necessary in the interest of visual amenity (3). It is also necessary to ensure that the bathroom window is obscure glazed, with no opening light lower than 1.7m above ground level, in order to protect the living conditions of adjoining occupiers (4).

Jennifer A Vyse
INSPECTOR

SCHEDULE OF CONDITIONS

APP/A3010/D/25/3373854

26 Harewood Avenue, Retford, Nottinghamshire DN22 7PH

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin no later than three years from the date of this decision.
- 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

Site and Location Plan	PC604/01
------------------------	----------

Existing Plans and Elevations	PC604/02
-------------------------------	----------

Proposed Plans	PC604/03
----------------	----------

Proposed Elevations	PC604/04
---------------------	----------

- 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used on the existing building.
- 4) The bathroom window shown on the approved plans shall not be glazed or re-glazed at any time other than with obscure glass, the details of which have previously been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority, with any opening light to be no lower than 1.7 metres above ground level.

-----End of Conditions Schedule-----