

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 February 2017

by Susan Ashworth BA (Hons) BPL MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 9th March 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/N3020/W/16/3162444

32-34 Norman Road, Mapperley, Nottingham NG3 6LN

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Clifford Holmes against the decision of Gedling Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2016/0698, dated 2 May 2016, was refused by notice dated 19 October 2016.
 - The development proposed is to demolish existing builder's workshop and to erect 1 pair semi-detached 2½ storey houses.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary matters

2. The application was submitted in outline with all matters reserved to be dealt with at a later stage. I have dealt with the appeal on that basis.
3. The grounds of appeal included some written measurements of the proposed development. I cannot be certain that interested parties have had sight of these measurements or without plans could accurately interpret them. Consequently I have determined the appeal on the basis of the information before the Council at the time of its decision.

Main Issue

4. The main issue in this case is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. The area surrounding the appeal site is primarily residential in character and comprises a mix of predominantly semi-detached and detached houses, generally constructed in brick. Properties are generally two storeys in height, although I noted that some of the newer buildings, including flats opposite and terraced properties fronting Porchester Road, have 2.5 storeys. Older properties on Norman Road have robust forms and are regularly spaced.
 6. The workshop that currently occupies the site is a single storey, flat roofed building that is not prominent in the street scene. The site is screened to an extent by a mature street tree and vegetation. Although it does not reflect the character of the area, it has a neutral impact on the appearance of the area because of its low height and subservient form. Permission is sought for the
-

demolition of that building and its replacement with a pair of semi-detached houses, 2.5 storeys high.

7. Planning law requires that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. In this case the development plan includes the Gedling Borough Aligned Core Strategy 2014 (the Core Strategy) and Saved Policies from the Replacement Local Plan 2005 (the Local Plan).
8. Policy 10 of the Core Strategy requires that all new development makes, amongst other things, a positive contribution to the public realm and sense of place and states that development will be assessed in terms of its treatment of matters including street patterns, plot sizes, density, massing, scale, proportion, and architectural detailing. Similarly Policies ENV1, H7 and H16 of the Local Plan advise that permission will be granted for development provided it is of a high standard of design that has regard to the appearance of the area and does not adversely affect the area by reason of its scale, bulk, form or layout.
9. The Council, in its officer report, is satisfied that the site is suitable for residential development given that it is situated within the urban area. Given that the predominant character of the area is residential, and that the present use does not conform to that character, I have no reason to disagree.
10. Although the application is made in outline with all matters reserved, the description of development specifies a pair of semi-detached dwellings of a certain height. Nevertheless, no illustrative details of how such development could be achieved on the site were submitted with the application. Nor are there any details of how the development would relate to neighbouring buildings in terms of their height or space between them. Whilst the measurements of the development were submitted with the appeal I do not have comparative measurements of neighbouring sites, or a site layout before me. Accordingly I cannot be certain that the site can satisfactorily accommodate the quantum or height of development and reflect the layout, massing, and pattern of development in the surrounding area.
11. Consequently the proposal as submitted would not meet the tests of Policy 10 of the Core Strategy or Policies ENV1, H7, and H16 of the Local Plan as outlined above.
12. I have noted the appellant's frustration with the time taken to determine the planning application and with levels of communication. However, this is a matter for the Council and has no bearing on my decision.
13. For the reasons set out above, and taking into account all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

S Ashworth

INSPECTOR