
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 August 2017

by K Ford BSocSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

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

Decision date: 11th September 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Q3060/W/17/3173960

61 Ribblesdale Road, Sherwood, Nottingham NG5 3GY

- 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 Tyers against the decision of City of Nottingham Council.
 - The application Ref 16/02400/PFUL3 (PP-05094618), dated 27 April 2016, was refused by notice dated 30 November 2016.
 - The development proposed is new detached dwelling to side of existing property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The plans for the proposal were amended during the course of determining the application. I have assessed the appeal on the details of the plan referenced RC/DT/07/04/16/01 Rev 1 and used the description of development used on the decision notice to reflect this.
3. At the time of determining the application the street tree in front of the appeal site was incorrectly drawn on the plan. A plan identifying a revised location of the street tree was submitted with the appeal by the appellant and the views of the Council were sought.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

5. The appeal site is the side garden land of No 61 Ribblesdale Road, a detached property in a residential area. The site sits adjacent to a public right of way (PROW) that links Ribblesdale Road to Valley Road. Ribblesdale Road is a tree lined road of inter-war semi-detached and detached properties set back from the road, behind small boundary walls. A mature street tree, planted in the verge stands in front of the property. Properties in the road sit on wide plots with small gaps between neighbouring dwellings. The gap between No 61 and 1 Mossdale Road is however uncharacteristically wider than other properties in the area because of the PROW. A number of properties have been extended to create dwellings of substantial size and No 61 has an extant planning permission for a first floor side and rear extension adjacent to 59 but it has not yet been implemented. The proposal is to build a 2 storey, 4 bedroom detached

- dwelling between No 61 and the PROW. Provision for parking 2 cars would be provided at the front of the dwelling.
6. The proposal would follow broadly the same building line and would be of similar height and depth to surrounding properties. However, whilst the separation between the proposal and No 61 would be comparable to elsewhere in the road, particularly where properties have been extended, the dwelling would be significantly narrower than its immediate neighbours on both sides, a reflection of the narrow plot on which it would be built. There may be properties of similar width elsewhere in the area but properties in Ribblesdale Road are substantially wider than the proposal and so it would appear much smaller in scale and consequently be an incongruous and obtrusive addition to the street scene. It would not therefore constitute an appropriate form of infill development.
 7. The proposal would be of simple design with a hipped roof. The materials proposed are reflective of other examples in the area but there is a lack of detail in terms of architectural elements and finish seen on other properties in the vicinity. There has been change to dwellings in the road but there is still a unifying character which the proposal would not replicate.
 8. The gap between No 61 and 1 Mossdale Road has a positive impact on the character of the area at a point where Mossdale Road and Ribblesdale Road converge. The proposal would lead to a loss of openness that the lack of built development creates, to the detriment of the area. The proposal would not however make the PROW less desirable as a route for pedestrians or increase the perception of risk to personal safety. The PROW is a short straight pathway, the full length of which can be seen from both Ribblesdale Road and Valley Road. It is also lit along its full length and at the access point on Ribblesdale Road. Any benefits of passive surveillance offered by the proposal would though be limited given that the windows closest to the PROW serve bedrooms and a landing.
 9. A mature street tree stands in front of the appeal site. I have not received any technical evidence from the Council to indicate that, based on the revised drawing, adequate access cannot be achieved without the removal of the tree. The proposal would not therefore conflict with policy NE5 of the Nottingham Local Plan which seeks to protect existing trees adjacent to development.
 10. The proposal would not be detrimental to the PROW or lead to the loss of a street tree. The prevailing matter however is the size and appearance of the proposed property which would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. The proposal would consequently conflict with policy 10 of the Aligned Core Strategies Part 1 Local Plan 2014 which requires that new development should be designed to make a positive contribution to the public realm and sense of place and reinforce the characteristics of the local area.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons outlined above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal is dismissed.

K Ford

INSPECTOR