



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 March 2026

by Graham Wraight BA(Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 March 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/W3005/D/25/3377036

Mill Pond Cottage, Newbound Lane, Teversal, Nottinghamshire NG17 3JQ

- 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 Gary Taylor against the decision of Ashfield District Council.
 - The application Ref is V/2025/0200.
 - The development proposed is a single storey side extension traditional oak framed extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey side extension traditional oak framed extension at Mill Pond Cottage, Newbound Lane, Teversal, Nottinghamshire NG17 3JQ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref V/2025/0200, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawings: Proposed Location Plan + Site Plan, Proposed Plan, Proposed West Elevation, Proposed South Elevation and Amended Proposed North Elevation.
 - 2) Within 6 months of the date of this permission, the north elevation of the extension hereby approved shall be altered to reflect the Amended Proposed North Elevation (received by the Council on the 11 September 2025). For the avoidance of doubt the alterations cover the provision of stone on the front of the link section of the extension, insertion of a window in the front gable elevation of the kitchen and erection of a stone wall to the front of the front gable of the kitchen.

Preliminary Matter

2. A side extension has already been erected at the appeal property but the appellant proposes to make amendments to it. This would consist of the facing of the link section with the original dwelling in stone, the insertion of a window to the front elevation and the building of a stone wall immediately in front of that elevation. These are proposals that were put before the Council during the determination of the planning application and are referred to in the appellant's Statement of Case. Accordingly, I have considered the appeal on the basis that this is the development that is before me.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling, on the non-designated heritage asset (NDHA) and on the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The Council refers to the appeal property as being a NDHA, but they provide no specific details or explanation in this regard. The appellant has however identified that this is as part of the wider range of former farm and mill buildings under building record M17301, Newbound Mill, with the appeal property forming one half of what was the original farmhouse at the centre of the group. The adjoining dwelling has been extended at two storey height to its side and rear, and the appeal dwelling itself has a two storey extension to its front elevation. I am satisfied on the basis of the information that has been provided that the appeal property is part of a NDHA, formed by the appeal dwelling and the buildings adjoining and adjacent to it.
5. The extension is single storey and sits to the side of the appeal property, projecting slightly forward of what is its front elevation. The design rationale set out by the appellant is coherent and legitimate in its approach. The extension appears as an outbuilding that has been attached to the original dwelling. It is subservient in size and whilst timber has been used as the facing material, this is a material that is commonly found on outbuildings in rural areas. There is evidence of a range of materials, including timber, in the area that surrounds the appeal site. The roofing material is slate and although this differs from that of the main roof it does not adjoin it, and it too is an appropriate material in its surroundings.
6. There is considerable merit also in that the link between the extension and the main dwelling has been made predominantly into the front extension, as opposed to into the fabric of what would have been the original building. The rest of the extension has been positioned so to be away from the side elevation of the original farmhouse and thus has not disturbed or covered it. This is a benefit of the development when compared to the alternative side extension which the Council found to be acceptable in 2019. At present the front elevation of the extension has limited visual interest but this would be adequately addressed by the proposed amendments that have been put forward.
7. Subject to those amendments, the extension would complement the host dwelling and not cause harm to its character and appearance. It would also not cause harm to the wider NDHA, to which there have already been a number of changes including extensions. There are only limited views of its front and side elevation possible from outside of the appeal site due to the positioning of other buildings. But in any event, I have found that when altered as proposed its visual relationship with the main dwelling would be acceptable. Its rear elevation is screened by the existing garage but even if that were to be removed, the extension is not dominant or visually unacceptable when viewed from the rear.
8. The plan showing the western elevation of the extension does not show either the solar panels that have been placed on the roof nor the two roof windows inserted into it. However, neither of those features has an unacceptable visual impact on the extension itself, the NDHA or the wider area, being well-screened from views because of their location and the positioning of adjacent buildings. Their absence from the plans is of no consequence in terms of my overall assessment of the appeal.
9. For these reasons I conclude that, subject to the amendments put forward, the extension would not result in harm to the character and appearance of the host

dwelling, the NDHA or the surrounding area. Consequently, it would accord with Policies ST1, HG7 and EV2 of the Ashfield Local Plan Review 2002, where collectively they seek to safeguard character and appearance. There would also be no conflict with the aims of the National Planning Policy Framework or the Residential Extensions Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2014 in the same regard.

Conditions

10. A condition setting out the approved plans is necessary to provide certainty. It is also necessary to impose a condition requiring that the works proposed to the north elevation are carried out within a set time period, as these are required to make the development acceptable in visual terms. The condition suggested by the Council that materials match is not required as I have found that, subject to the amendments to the north elevation, the development as erected is acceptable in this respect.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, the appeal should be allowed.

Graham Wraight

INSPECTOR