



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 August 2019

by Diane Cragg DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 October 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/N3020/D/19/3229399

47 Florence Road, Mapperley NG3 6LJ

- 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 M Phutela against the decision of Gedling Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2019/0103, dated 5 February 2019, was refused by notice dated 2 April 2019.
 - The development proposed is to construct detached garage/workshop.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two-storey semi-detached house on a corner plot facing Florence Road. The side gable and side garden boundary of the property faces Hillview Road. The existing double garage is located at the end of the garden beyond the rear boundary fence with access from Hillview Road. The rear garden is separated from the road by fencing, located on the back edge of the footpath, and is sufficiently high to provide privacy. The adjacent corner property facing Daisy Road is similarly orientated with garage and rear boundary fencing facing Hillview Road.
4. The area is predominately residential in character with a wide variety of house types. There is a certain amount of consistency in the placement of dwellings, which are on the whole set back from the road frontage. Front boundaries are generally defined by walls or fences or a combination of hard and soft landscaping and overall the variety of design, set back and boundary detail of dwellings provides a pleasant residential environment. During my site visit I saw the two relatively new dwellings referred to by the appellant located further along Hillview Road. I consider that these dwellings conform to the character I have identified.
5. Given the variety of house types in the area, the appearance and height of the garage would be acceptable in the street. However, although fences and means of enclosure are set on front and side boundaries of plots, buildings generally are not. I find that, although the appearance and height of the replacement garage would not be at odds with the surrounding character, its size and siting,

close to the back edge of footpath, would result in a prominent structure that would not sit comfortably in the street.

6. Consequently, I conclude that the siting and size of the development would harm the character and appearance of the area and would be contrary to the objectives of Policy 10 of the Gedling Borough Aligned Core Strategies Part 1 Local Plan adopted September 2014 which requires that development makes a positive contribution to the public realm and sense of place and, should be assessed against its treatment of a number of elements including the position of buildings. Conflict would also arise with the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks, in section 12, to achieve well-design places by ensuring that development meets several criteria including being visually attractive as a result of good architecture and layout.
7. I note Policy LPD 43 of the Local Planning Document Part 2 Local Plan adopted July 2018 relates to the erection of extensions to dwellings. I do not consider this policy to be directly relevant to the development.

Other Matters

8. I note that the appellant asserts that other development could be placed in the rear garden area without the need for planning permission. However, I have not been provided with any specific details of an alternative scheme to compare with the appeal development and there is no evidence before me of any realistic prospect that an alternative scheme would be implemented.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Diane Cragg

Inspector