The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 March 2018

by Sarah Colebourne MA, MRTPI

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

Decision date: 21st March 2018

Appeal Ref: APP/N1025/W/17/3190442
1 Sycamore Crescent, Sandiacre, Nottingham, NG10 5EY

- 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 Mrs Judith Chester against the decision of Erewash Borough Council.
- The application Ref ERE/0517/0058, dated 25 May 2017, was refused by notice dated 24 July 2017.
- The development proposed is the erection of a detached dwelling.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The development plan includes policies 10 in the Council's Core Strategy (CS) and H12 in the Erewash Local Plan (LP). These seek to ensure that proposals make a positive contribution to and are in scale and character with their surroundings. They accord with the National Planning Policy Framework ('the Framework') which seeks to ensure that development is visually attractive and adds to the overall quality of the area.

4. The appeal site is located on a corner plot in a street of predominantly semi-detached houses within a residential area. It has a corner position and prominent siting on land that is elevated above that part of Sycamore Crescent to the side and Coronation Avenue to the rear, making it prominent in views from there. It forms part of the side garden of 1 Sycamore Crescent but has recently been fenced off. Whilst most houses in the area are sited on modestly sized plots, the corner plots are more generously sized and make a positive contribution to the openness of the street scene. The presence of a dwelling would reduce this openness considerably to the detriment of the area, notwithstanding the retention of the grass verge between the site and the road.

5. Although there are a mix of dwelling types in the wider area those are not seen clearly within the context of the appeal site. The form of the proposed dwelling, a detached house, would contrast with the prevailing semi-detached form of the other houses in the immediate street scene. This would be

exacerbated by its width which would be significantly narrower than the existing houses. Whilst the gap between the new house and the house at no 1 has been increased from the previously refused scheme, it remains small and is approximately half the size of the gap between most of the other houses. As a result of its narrow width and although the window and door detailing is similar to the adjacent house, the solid (wall) to void (window and door openings) ratios in the elevations of the new house are much less than those in the other houses. For these reasons, the proposed house would result in a cramped appearance at odds with the character and appearance of the street scene.

6. The other differences from the previous scheme which include the rear elevation, the chimney and the stepping down of the roof height, do not overcome the harm that would be caused.

7. The contribution to the borough's housing requirement would be very small given that only one dwelling is proposed and this does not outweigh the significant harm that would be caused in terms of the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposed development, by reason of its siting, form, size, scale and design, would be contrary to CS policy 10 and LP policy H12. It would therefore conflict with the development plan as a whole and there are no material considerations that justify determining the appeal otherwise. The appeal should be dismissed.

Sarah Colebourne

Inspector