



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 August 2017

by Darren Hendley BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

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

Decision date: 4th September 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Q3060/W/17/3175507

Land adjacent to 190 Longmead Drive, Nottingham NG5 6DJ

- 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 D Kitching against the decision of City of Nottingham Council.
 - The application Ref 16/02575/PFUL3, dated 10 November 2016, was refused by notice dated 2 March 2017.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a detached dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site forms the side garden of 190 Longmead Drive, enclosed by hedgerows on the site frontage, and to the side and rear. The site is found at the front of a number of properties arranged in a horseshoe pattern, with the properties to the rear accessed from Longmead Drive by footpaths. These properties are semi-detached in form, apart from at the rear where they form a short terrace. This pattern is repeated intermittently along Longmead Drive, with the remainder principally comprising rows of short terraces and semi-detached properties whose plots front onto Longmead Drive. Towards Sherbrook Road, there are longer rows of two and three storey terraced properties, although these have a markedly different character from the site.
4. The horseshoe pattern provides a pleasing character with a balanced arrangement of properties and with the spacing in between provided by the gardens and the footpaths. The siting of the proposal on one side of the horseshoe pattern would significantly disrupt and imbalance this current arrangement, and result in the loss of much of the side garden, which contributes towards this character. As a detached dwelling, it would also appear incongruous in relation to the house types which make up the horseshoe pattern and, more broadly, the types of dwellings found along the majority of Longmead Drive.
5. The proposal would also be prominent with its proximity to the site frontage, and this would exacerbate the imbalance in the horseshoe pattern, when

viewed from the streetscene. Its orientation would also result in a side elevation facing Longmead Drive and this would be in noticeable contrast to the existing dwellings whose plots front onto Longmead Drive, as they are orientated towards to the road. Although Nos 174 and 188 do present a side elevation in the direction of Longmead Drive, they are sited much further back, and so they do not result in the same detrimental effect. The hedgerows would also not provide effective screening as they are considerably less in height than the proposal.

6. The difference in land levels between the proposal and No 190 would not overcome the incongruous effects on the streetscene, as the difference would be modest and with the proposal being sited closer to the site frontage than No 190. It would also be set at a higher land level than the properties that are sited further back, and this would result in limiting the visibility of the horseshoe pattern from the streetscene. As it would be clearly seen as a separate dwelling to No 190, with its siting and scale, it would not be viewed as subservient.
7. The site forms part of the unifying and valued character of the horseshoe of properties, and this forms a positive local context in respect of paragraphs 58 and 60 of the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) which seek, respectively, that development should respond to local character and reflect the identity of local surroundings, and promote or reinforce local distinctiveness. The proposal does not though respond positively to its context, for the reasons I have set out, with its siting and appearance.
8. In respect of the bungalows which have been constructed on Northwood Crescent, as they are found on either side of the access path, unlike the proposal, they do not imbalance the arrangement of these properties. I am therefore satisfied they are materially different with regard to character and appearance.
9. The proposed materials, hipped roof and detailing would be broadly in keeping with the area; sufficient garden space and parking would be provided for the future occupiers, as well the existing occupiers of No 190; and the proposal would not unduly harm the privacy levels of the occupiers of neighbouring properties. It would also be located where there is accessibility to local services. However, as the proposal would be expected to be acceptable with regard to these matters, they can only be given neutral weight.
10. A slight benefit would arise from the addition of one dwelling to the housing stock and mix, although I do not consider this would outweigh the considerable harm that would arise to the character and appearance. I do not consider the site to be underused given that that it is maintained as a garden, and appreciably contributes to the character and appearance of the area.
11. I am also aware the appellant, with regard to the existing occupiers, does not wish to extend No 190 to form a separate dwelling. I have not though being made aware of such a scheme, and therefore I am unable to assess what the effects on their living conditions might be, compared to the proposal. I have thus determined the appeal on the basis of the proposal before me.
12. Therefore, I conclude the proposal would have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of area and, as such, it would not comply with Policy 10 of Greater Nottingham Aligned Core Strategies Part 1 Local Plan (2014)

which states that development should be designed to reinforce valued local characteristics and have regard to the local context. Paragraph 56 of the Framework is also clear that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development and as this would not be achieved by the proposal due to its effects on the character and appearance, it would not constitute sustainable development for the purposes of the Framework.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons set out above, the appeal should be dismissed.

Darren Hendley

INSPECTOR