



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 October 2025

**by K Mee BA(Hons) MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 December 2025

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/A3010/D/25/3371067**

**14 The Paddocks, Beckingham, Nottinghamshire DN10 4PD**

- 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 E Whitehouse against the decision of Bassetlaw District Council.
  - The application Ref is 25/00332/HSE.
  - The development proposed is a rear extension.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Main Issues

2. The main issues are:
  - The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area; and
  - The effect of the proposal on living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties with particular regard to outlook, light and privacy.

### Reasons

#### *Character and Appearance*

3. The appeal property comprises a modest detached bungalow with a simple dual-pitch roof, similar in size and design to neighbouring properties on this residential estate. Whilst some of the surrounding dwellings have been extended and altered, the general uniformity and rhythm of built form within the street scene is retained.
4. The proposals include a two-storey extension to the rear. This extension would be wider than the existing dwelling, would project into the rear garden by a considerable distance and with a much higher eaves height. It would therefore dominate the host dwelling and, despite its set back, would be highly visible from the street, particularly when viewed from the east. Consequently, it would appear as an incongruous, bulky and cramped form of development which would reduce the spaciousness of the existing rear garden and fail to integrate well with its surroundings.
5. Although there is no explicit requirement for development to be 'subservient' within Policy ST33 of the Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2038 (May 2024) (Local Plan), there is an expectation that it is of high quality, which is based upon a robust understanding of local distinctiveness and respects the local context and complements the scale, height, massing of the surrounding area, integrating well

with surrounding streets. Policy ST2 of the Local Plan reinforces this approach by requiring new development to not cause significant harm to the existing built character by reason of its location, size, scale and form.

6. Consequently, by introducing such a large built form at the rear of the existing bungalow, the consistent character would be eroded such that there would be harm to the character and appearance of the area. Therefore, I conclude that the proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area in conflict with Policies ST2 and ST33 of the Local Plan.

### *Living Conditions*

7. The Council have paid particular regard to impacts on the neighbouring dwelling at 12 The Paddocks (No. 12). However, I find that due to the presence of a car port, garage and lengthy single storey rear extension at No. 12, alongside the boundary with the appeal site, the impact on outlook and light would not be harmful.
8. The proposed extension would be visible from the garden of 16 The Paddocks (No. 16). However, due to its position relative to the extension it would be unlikely to have any harmful effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of that property in that respect. It would however appear as an overbearing feature close to the boundary which would have an adverse impact on outlook for the occupiers of No. 16 especially when viewed from their garden. This would be particularly problematic as No. 16's garden is much smaller than those surrounding it.
9. Whilst concerns have been raised regarding perceived overlooking, I am satisfied that the proposal would not adversely impact privacy for neighbouring occupiers. This is due to the siting of the proposed extension beyond the rear elevation of the existing dwelling, and the introduction of windows at first floor level being to the rear elevation only.
10. I therefore conclude that the proposal would not cause harm to the living conditions of No. 12 with particular regard to outlook, light or privacy. However, it would cause harm to the living conditions of No. 16 with regard to outlook. Accordingly, the development would conflict with Policy ST46 of the Local Plan which seeks to ensure that new development does not have an overbearing impact on existing residents.

### **Other Matters**

11. My attention has been drawn to examples of other extensions to bungalows in the local area involving increased ridge heights. These examples are not directly comparable to the appeal before me both in terms of context and the proposal.
12. Reference has also been made to the Government's publicised intention to support gentle densification through upwards extensions to support householders in making changes they need to meet today's living demands. However, this relates to changes to permitted development legislation for householder extensions. As such, I have afforded both these matters limited weight in my decision and they do not lead me to an alternative conclusion on the harm identified in the main issues.

### **Conclusion**

13. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposal would conflict with the development plan as a whole and there are no material considerations that indicate

that the development should be determined otherwise than in accordance with it.  
Therefore, the appeal should be dismissed.

*K Mee*

INSPECTOR