



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 November 2019

by R E Walker BA Hons DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 November 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/N3020/D/19/3236277 79 Main Road, Gedling NG4 3HD

- 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 Daryl Leivers against the decision of Gedling Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2019/0508, dated 24 May 2019, was refused by notice dated 23 August 2019.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a two-storey rear extension and loft conversion including complete new roofs and dormer windows to front and rear. Decking to be constructed against rear of property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The description of development in the heading above has been taken from the planning application form. However, in Part E of the appeal form it is stated that the description of development has not changed but, nevertheless, a different wording has been entered. Neither of the main parties has provided written confirmation that a revised description of development has been agreed. Accordingly, I have used the one given on the original application which accurately describes the proposals.
3. The site visit procedure was altered from an access required site visit to an unaccompanied site visit as the appellant was not present when I arrived at the appeal site during the pre-arranged period and I was able to see all I needed to from public land.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the street scene within Main Road.

Reasons

5. The appeal building is a detached 2-storey house with a hipped roof and balanced frontage comprising of 2 bay windows either side of a central front door. The appeal building is positioned in a prominent location near a corner on Main Road where it is seen between a detached bungalow (No 77) and a 2-storey property (No 81). It appears to have a similar height to No 81.

6. The proposed development would result in a significant increase in the bulk and massing of the property both in terms of its depth and height. The introduction of the gable pitched roof form, with the increased height and dormers to the front and rear, would appear unduly dominant when viewed from Main Road. Whilst I recognise that the proposed materials would be appropriate, the proposed development would, in my view, appear out of proportion and at odds with the scale of No 77 and No 81. As a result, on this prominent position, it would cause significant harm to the appearance of this part of the street scene.
7. The appellant has referred me to an alternative plan put forward during the application. This amended plan reduces the overall roof area from the original design. However, the proposed development would still appear out of keeping with the scale of built form between No 77 and No 81 Main Road. It does not therefore overcome my concerns on this main issue.
8. I recognise that there are a variety of property types and roof forms within the local area, including similar examples along Main Road and at the 'Keepmoat' development. However, my concerns relate not to the principle of the dormers and scale of the resulting building, but to the specific appearance of the proposed development in the street scene between No 77 and No 81 Main Road.
9. The Council's decision notice confirms that the proposed rear deck is not a matter of contention for the main parties. No other party has commented on this aspect of the proposals either. I also consider that it would be an appropriate addition to the house. However, this does not outweigh the harm that I have identified from the proposed roof alterations to the street scene within this part of Main Road.
10. I therefore conclude that the proposals would conflict with Policy 10 of the Greater Nottingham Aligned Core Strategies Part 1 Local Plan Adopted 2014 (LP1) and Policy LPD 43 of the Gedling Borough Local Planning Document Part 2 Local Plan Adopted 2018 (LP2). These policies aim to ensure that development positively contributes to the character of the area through, amongst other things, good design and appropriate height and built form. Although the Council has referred to LPD 32 of the LP2 in its reason for refusal, this appears to be more concerned with living conditions than character and appearance.
11. Policy 10 of the LP 1 and LPD 43 of the LP2 policies are consistent with the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). I therefore conclude that the proposals conflict with paragraphs 127 and 130 of the Framework which broadly seek to secure high quality design.

Other Matters

12. I have had regard to other matters raised including any disturbance during construction, parking, access rights and fears over the future use of the property. However, any disturbance would be for a limited period during construction and I am not satisfied those concerns would amount to a reason to withhold planning permission. The access and parking would be satisfactory and there is no evidence that highway safety would be compromised. Moreover, any planning permission would not override any legal rights of access and there is no substantive evidence that the property would be used for anything other than its stated use.

13. Concerns regarding the processing of the application, including matters relating to communication and timeframes are not issues that I can assess as part of this appeal. The validity or not of such matters do not affect the planning merits or effects of the proposals before me.
14. I recognise that extending the property might meet the appellant's need for increased accommodation. I also accept that the proposal would not cause harm to the living conditions of the occupants of No 77 or No 81. However, these are not considerations that outweigh the harm that I have identified from the proposed development to the street scene within this part of Main Road.

Conclusion

15. I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Robert Walker

INSPECTOR