



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 February 2019

by Julie Dale Clark BA (Hons) DipTP MCD DMS MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 August 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/W3005/W/18/3213588

3 Hankin Street, Hucknall, Nottingham NG15 7RR

- 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 Ali Zulfiqar against the decision of Ashfield District Council.
 - The application Ref V/2018/0410, dated 3 July 2018, was refused by notice dated 15 August 2018.
 - The development proposed is proposed single-storey 1-bed apartment.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. I consider that the main issues are the effect of the proposed apartment on (1) the character and appearance of the area; (2) living conditions of future occupants of the apartment; and (3) highway and pedestrian safety.

Reasons

Character & Appearance

3. The appeal site located to the rear of commercial properties on Portland Road. It has a frontage to Hankin Street. The proposed would comprise a one bedroom single storey dwelling with a modest area of amenity space to the rear.
4. Amongst other things, Local Plan Policy¹ ST1 indicates that development will be permitted provided that it does not affect the character of the area and Policy HG5 relates to acceptable design in terms of appearance, scale and siting. Whilst the appeal site comprises an unattractive, litter strewn area of land that I accept is unsightly in the street scene, this does not justify the cramped development proposed. Taking the area as a whole, including Hankin Street and the street opposite, the proposal would appear out of character with the area due to its size and location and therefore detract from the character and appearance of the area. This would conflict with policies ST1 and HG5.

¹ Ashfield Local Plan Review, Adopted November 2002.

Living Conditions

5. The proposed accommodation would provide a living area with a kitchen off it and a separate bedroom and shower room. Its outdoor amenity space would comprise a modest area to the rear of the apartment. Whilst access to this area could be obtained from the double doors leading from the lounge / kitchen, there would also appear to be an access through the service yard / parking area of commercial properties on Portland Street, which also include residential accommodation on the upper floors. Notwithstanding this unusual arrangement, this area is very modest.
6. The appellant is of the view that the proposed room sizes and amenity space complies with the Council SPD² standards. However, this does not appear to be the case which only adds to the cramped characteristic of the proposed apartment. This would conflict with policies ST1 and HG5.

Highway & Pedestrian Safety

7. The proposal includes no provision for off-street parking and due to the location of the proposal it is likely to interfere with the visibility of vehicles leaving the adjacent yard area. Hankin Street has double yellow lines which would limit the availability of off-street parking. This poor arrangement adds to my concern about the suitability of this site for this proposal.
8. The appellant considers that the site is accessible in terms of its proximity to the Town Centre and easy access to shops and public transport. However, I disagree. The site is not within the Town Centre and whilst some shops and public transport are available, this does not warrant the flexibility advised by the SPD³.

Other Matters & Conclusion

9. The appellant states that the proposal would contribute to the housing mix and the strategic planned housing supply. I have considered this in the light of the Office for National Statistics updated annual affordability ratios⁴.
10. I have taken into account the National Planning Framework⁵ and all other matters raised but none alter my conclusion. I conclude that the proposed apartment would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area; the living conditions of future occupiers of the dwelling; and highway and pedestrian safety. It would conflict with Local Plan Policies ST1 and HG5 and the SPD's referred to.

J D Clark

INSPECTOR

² Ashfield Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document November 2014 (SPD).

³ Ashfield Residential Car Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document November 2014 (SPD).

⁴ Office for National Statistics (ONS). Annual Affordability Ratios and Local Housing Need. Published 28 March 2019.

⁵ Department of Housing, Communities and Local Government National Planning Policy Framework, July 2018.