
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 April 2017

by Zoe Raygen Dip URP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 20 April 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/N1025/W/17/3166907

302 Wilsthorpe Road, Long Eaton, Derbyshire NG10 4AA

- 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 Dale Corner against the decision of Erewash Borough Council.
 - The application Ref ERE/1116/0056, dated 22 November 2016, was refused by notice dated 9 January 2017.
 - The development proposed is change of use and alterations to provide new dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Background and Main Issue

2. The Council has granted planning permission for the erection of a house on the appeal site under reference ERE/0316/0006. The proposal which is the subject of this appeal is similar except for the introduction of a gable roof rather than the approved hipped roof. There is no dispute therefore that the principle of a dwelling on the site is acceptable.
3. Bearing this in mind I consider that the main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is located adjacent to the entrance to West Park from Wilsthorpe Road. To the south are two pairs of semi-detached properties set back from the road with large front gardens. On the other side of the entrance to West Park is a long row of mainly detached houses set back behind a service road accessed from Wilsthorpe Road. The houses have in common, a fairly uniform building line and hipped roofs.
 5. The appeal site closely relates to the two pairs of semi-detached houses. All have been extended in a manner which reflects their uniformity of design including their hipped roof. The small group of houses provide an attractive setting to West Park beyond and although set back are particularly visible from the adjacent main road.
 6. The height, mass and location of the proposed building would respect the adjacent dwellings. Nevertheless, the introduction of a gable roof on the proposed house would be in stark contrast to the hipped roofs of the adjacent group of houses creating an awkward and discordant note in the streetscene.
-

This would be particularly so given the close proximity of the proposed house to 302 Wilsthorpe Road where the relationship between the two roof styles would be particularly prominent and visually jarring.

7. The appellants suggestion that the proposal would act as a buffer between the period properties and the Park lacks legitimacy given that the row of houses provide an attractive setting to the Park which would be eroded by the incongruous roof design of the proposal. I acknowledge that gable roofs can be a common feature within streetscenes. Nevertheless , they are not prevalent within the line of dwellings on the north east side of Wilsthorpe Road where the appeal site is located.
8. I acknowledge that it may be possible to alter a hipped roof to a gable roof, following the erection and occupation of the proposed house, without the requirement for planning permission. It may therefore be cheaper to build the proposal with a gable roof. Nevertheless, this would not justify the erection of a house that would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. Furthermore, I have seen no substantive evidence to indicate that there is a significant probability that such an alteration would be carried out. This limits the weight I can give to this suggestion.
9. For the reasons above I conclude that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore be contrary to Policy 10 of the Erewash Core Strategy, saved Policy H12 of the Erewash Local Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework. These require, amongst other things, that development should be of high quality design that has regard to local context and reinforce valued local characteristics.

Other matters

10. The gates to West Park are grade II listed. They are sited forward of the appeal site and consequently I saw on site that there are only very limited viewpoints where the gates and the appeal site are seen in conjunction with each other. This together with the distance of the appeal site from the gates, leads me to conclude that the proposal would not be harmful to the setting of the gates.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons set out above, having had regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Zoe Raygen

INSPECTOR