

Member Interest:

Delegated Report

Application Number: V/2025/0512

Address: 3, Harwood Place, Sutton in Ashfield, Nottinghamshire, NG17 4FB

Description of Works: Extension to Existing Outbuilding

The Application	Extension To Existing Outbuilding
Policy Considerations	Ashfield Local Plan Review (ALPR) (2002) ST1 – Development ST2- Main Urban Area National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2024) Part 12 – Achieving Well Designed Places Residential Design Guide (SPD) 2014 Residential Extensions Design Guide (SPD) 2014
Relevant Planning History	V/2022/0329- Summer house at the rear of the property - Conditional Consent- 19/07/2022
Summary of comments received	Two resident comments objecting to the proposal: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Noise concerns• Disrespectful neighbours – used for parties late into the night• Rats One resident comment supporting the proposal: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Visually unobtrusive• Owners have done repair works to the road.
Comments on above	Issues around anti-social behaviour and rats are not planning considerations. These should be reported to the relevant departments (ASB and EH) to deal with.
Summary	The Site and Application The application site is an end terrace property located on Harwood Place within the main urban area of Sutton in Ashfield where development is acceptable under policy ST2 of the ALPR 2002. The application seeks retrospective consent for an extension to the existing outbuilding. The extension will extend 4.038m from the front of

the existing building by 3.603m in width. A mono-pitched roof has been proposed at the highest point is 2.46m going down to 2.245m.

Visual Amenity

Part 12 of the NPPF states that planning should ensure that developments function well and add to the overall quality of the area, stating that development that is not well designed should be refused.

Whilst the proposed outbuilding extension is situated at the end of the rear garden and as such is not viewable from the street scene, it still has a significant visual impact from the outlook of neighbouring properties. The materials proposed are a mixture of wooden panels. From a visit to the site, it is clear that the proposed extension to the outbuilding is not in keeping with either the existing dwelling or the outbuilding it is extended from.

Paragraph 135 of the NPPF details that developments should be visually attractive as a result of good architecture. The proposed outbuilding does not demonstrate good design principles; the materials whilst timber is a mixture of differing coloured and shaped panels, which looks incongruous within the wider site.

As such the proposed design is at odds with the existing outbuilding and dwelling due to the materials and design being out of keeping and resulting in an incongruent addition to the site. Resulting in a significant detrimental visual intrusion to the outlook from neighbouring properties.

Residential Amenity

Due to its positioning and the size and height of the proposal it is unlikely that it would have significant impact in regard to overbearing, overshadowing, or overlooking.

However, the Resident Extensions SPD (2014) 4.13 states that garden space of a reasonable size is important, development should ensure that a significant loss of garden area. From a visit to the site, it is clear that the outbuilding fills the rear garden of the site in almost its entirety, leaving a small area of paved yard between the rear elevation of the dwelling and building. Therefore, the proposed extension leaves the property with no functional outdoor space.

Paragraph 135(f) of the NPPF states development should promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users. The absence of functional garden space both negatively affects the amenity of the current residents and future occupiers of the site.

Two resident comments have been received which raise concerns over potential noise impact of the proposal.

	<p>From a visit to the site and comments from residents it is clear that the building is used as a bar/ pub. Whilst a home bar in an outbuilding isn't itself out with the remit of a residential use, the scale by which this development is proposed appears to be unnecessary for an ancillary outbuilding. No justification has been provided for the necessity of the proposal, and it is considered that the existing outbuilding approved under V/2022/0329 results in a large outbuilding which could more than accommodate this use.</p> <p>The existing outbuilding has led rise to anti-social behaviour and with that associated noise concerns which have negatively affected the neighbouring residents both on Harwood Place and Skegby Road. Given the proposal as a residential outbuilding and not for a change of use no noise assessments have been submitted. However, a number of complaints have been raised in the past to both Environmental Health and Anti-Social Behaviour Teams to this effect. It is considered that the proposed extension to the existing building would only exacerbate these concerns.</p> <p>As such it is considered that the scale of the proposal results in an overdevelopment of the site. This is evident in the loss of private rear garden space and as such this undermines the standards of amenity for existing and future users, contrary to paragraph 135(f) of the NPPF 2024 and the Residential Design SPD (2014).</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>The development would not comply with the provisions of the development plan, when considered as a whole. As such, it is recommended that planning permission be refused.</p>		
Recommendation	FULRE		
Reason(s)	Reason Code	Text	Monitor
	1.	<p>The proposed development, by reason of its size and scale would result in an unacceptable level of overdevelopment of the site and as such result in a significant loss of amenity space. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy ST1 of the Ashfield Local Plan Review (2002), Residential Extensions Design SPD (2014) and Chapter 12 of the NPPF.</p> <p>The proposed design is at odds with the</p>	

	2.	existing outbuilding and dwelling due to the materials and design being out of keeping and resulting in an incongruent addition to the site. It is therefore considered there would be a significant detrimental visual intrusion to the outlook from neighbouring properties. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy ST1 of the Ashfield Local Plan Review (2002), Residential Design SPD (2014) and Chapter 12 of the NPPF (2024).		
Informative	Informative	Informative Text		
Proactive Working	The application is clearly contrary to the development plan and other material planning considerations, as detailed within the reason(s) for refusal. Working proactively with the applicants would not have afforded the opportunity to overcome these problems, giving a false sense of hope and potentially incurring the applicants further unnecessary time and/or expense.			
	Signed		Dated	
Case Officer	L.Murray		27/11/2025	
Development Team Manager			28/11/2025	
Determined by Service Director Or on their behalf			28/11/2025	