
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 August 2019

by Diane Cragg DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6 November 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/N3020/D/19/3229063

50 Kent Road, Mapperley, Nottingham NG3 6BE

- 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 Andrew Sharpe against the decision of Gedling Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2019/0015, dated 20 December 2018, was refused by notice dated 1 March 2019.
 - The development proposed is extension to and remodelling of front and side elevations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. Kent Road is a predominately residential area with a wide variety of house types set on an undulating road. Adjacent to the appeal site the variety of property design, street trees, mature hedging and largely brick and render materials provide a pleasant residential environment.
4. 50 Kent Road is a brick built detached house set reasonably close to the road frontage and on an elevated plot, so that it is relatively prominent in the street scene. The proposed grey cladding to the front elevation would wrap around the edge of the building and sit against the existing brick work. It would contrast with most building materials in the street and would contrast awkwardly with the brick side gable walls. Due to the appeal sites prominent position the proposed cladding would appear particularly incongruous within the street scene resulting in harm to the character and appearance of the area.
5. The proposed extension would be in the space between the existing front elevation of the property and the hedge along the boundary. The extension design relies on the retention and growth of the front boundary hedge to screen it from the street. The existing hedge follows the slope of the road. The drawings show that the hedge would need to be continuous and follow the line of the flat roof extension in order to obscure the extension wall along the road frontage. New black metal fencing would enclose the new entrance steps. I find that the combination of the proximity of the extension to the boundary, its

height close to the road and reliance on the hedge and fencing to obscure it, would result in a development that would be overbearing on the road frontage and appear incongruous in the street to the detriment of the visual amenity of the area.

6. Consequently, I conclude that the development would detract from the character and appearance of the dwelling and the area and would be contrary to Policy 10 of the Gedling Borough Aligned Core Strategies Part 1 Local Plan adopted September 2014 and Policy LPD 43 of the Gedling Borough Local Planning Document Part 2 Local Plan adopted July 2018 (LP) which together seek to achieve development in keeping with its surroundings and makes a positive contribution to the public realm. Further, the development would conflict with paragraph 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework which requires development to be visually attractive, function well and add to the overall quality of the area.
7. Policy LPD 32 of the LP relates to the effect of development on the amenity of nearby residents. As the main issue in this appeal is the effect on the character and appearance of the area, I consider this policy has limited relevance to the appeal.

Other Matters

8. The appellant has drawn my attention to Policy LPD 34 of the LP. Policy LPD 34 states in relation to development in residential gardens that 'in all cases any development of residential garden land should not result in harm to the character and appearance of an area. Development involving front gardens should ensure that the character of the street scene is not harmed, and that appropriate boundary treatments and planting are retained'. This was not the policy upon which the Council based its decision however given my findings, the development would not accord with the provisions of this policy.
9. I appreciate that the development would provide level access to the site for a disabled relative. Whilst I have had regard to the need to provide level access to the property this need does not outweigh the harm I have identified.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above and having regard to all matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

Diane Cragg

INSPECTOR