
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 November 2025 by S Jamieson BA(Hons) MPlan

Decision by F Wilkinson BSc (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15th January 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/A3010/D/25/3372988

Folly Nook Bungalow, Folly Nook Lane, Ranskill, Nottinghamshire DN22 8NQ

- 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 Gavin Page against the decision of Bassetlaw District Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00755/HSE.
 - The development proposed is loft conversion, single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matters

3. Whilst development has already commenced, the single-storey rear extension, ground floor fenestration and other finishing details had not been carried out when I visited the site. Therefore, my assessment is made on the basis of the details of the proposed development on the drawings provided.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. Folly Nook Bungalow is located on the edge of the village. The appeal dwelling and the nearest neighbouring property are both detached, brick-built bungalows, with tiled, hipped roofs. Whilst there is variety in the age, design and roof forms of properties in the area, dormer windows are uncommon. Where present, these are single additions to properties that maintain a subordinate appearance to the roof. Overall, the modest scale of the appeal property and the neighbouring dwelling, along with the largely unextended roofscape, provides visual coherence that contributes positively to the rural character of this part of the lane.
6. The proposed loft conversion, incorporating a hip-to-gable extension, would substantially increase the mass of the dwelling. Combined with the proposed ground floor canopy, which would span the full width of the property and extend to the eaves, the scheme would result in a bulky, dominant roof form that would

appear disproportionate to the host dwelling. It would also relate poorly to the modest scale and hipped roof form of the neighbouring bungalow.

7. The addition of two large dormers to the front and rear of the dwelling, in an area where such features are generally absent, would also introduce discordant elements that would dominate the roof of the host dwelling and fail to integrate with the surrounding roofscape. The use of dark cladding would emphasise their prominence and incongruity, which would be exacerbated by the open aspect of the appeal site.
8. The Council raise no objections to the scale and impact of the proposed single-storey extension on the character and appearance of the area, and I find no reason to disagree. I also find that the proposed brick and render finish along with the use of concrete tiles would suitably assimilate with the mixed palette of materials along the lane. However, the scale of the roof extension and the size and proliferation of dormers, would result in an unduly large and incongruous development that would harm the character and appearance of the area.
9. The proposed development would therefore conflict with Policy ST33 of the Bassetlaw Local Plan (2024) insofar as it seeks to ensure that developments are of a high-quality design that respects the local context and complements the surrounding area. For the same reasons, the proposed development would also be contrary to the design aims of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Other Matters

10. I acknowledge that the appeal scheme might bring an existing building back into use, make it safe and watertight, and provide a more functional and sustainable living space for the appellant's family. However, I am unconvinced that these benefits could not be achieved through a less harmful scheme.
11. I accept that the appellant has sought building control consent for the works undertaken. However, this is a neutral matter in the consideration of this appeal, as it pertains to a separate regulatory process. My assessment has therefore been based on the requirement for planning permission, which has been duly applied for.
12. Similarly, the lack of third-party objections and the absence of harm in terms of neighbouring living conditions including light, privacy and outlook, are not benefits as such. They are not in themselves matters which would lead me to a different conclusion on the appeal scheme, which I have found would be harmful.

Conclusion and Recommendation

13. For the reasons given above and having had regard to other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

S Jamieson

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

14. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

F Wilkinson

INSPECTOR