



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 January 2020 by Darren Ellis MPlan

Decision by Susan Ashworth BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10th February 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/N3020/D/19/3241041

8 Pilkington Road, Mapperley, NG3 6HL

- 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 Miss Alina Suplacean against the decision of Gedling Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2019/0232, dated 11 March 2019, was refused by notice dated 23 August 2019.
 - The development proposed is the conversion of the existing bungalow into a house and a garage conversion into a living space.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are:
 - The effect of the development on the living conditions of occupiers of the neighbouring properties with particular regard to outlook and light,
 - The effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and wider area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring properties

4. 8 Pilkington Road is a modest, detached 'split level' dwelling, comprising a garage at street level with living accommodation above. The proposal seeks to alter the roof of the dwelling by increasing its height and providing a dormer window at the back to create first floor living accommodation. In addition, the garage would be converted to habitable space.
 5. Both immediately neighbouring properties have windows to habitable rooms that face the appeal property at close range. The proposed increase in roof height would be clearly apparent from those windows. Whilst outlook from the windows is already somewhat restricted, the proposal would have a more
-

significant overbearing impact than the existing situation. Accordingly, these rooms would be less pleasant places to be.

6. In addition, owing to the orientation of the appeal property and those on either side of it, the increase in roof height would consequently increase overshadowing and cause a loss of daylight to the side windows of the neighbouring properties.
7. The appellant has provided a drawing that compares the shading caused by the structure as it is at present with the shading that would occur if the property was extended in the manner proposed. However, the shadow indicated is based on the summer solstice at midday. This is when the sun is at its highest position in the sky and, consequently, when the shadows are at their shortest. As a result, the shadows caused by the new roof would be longer and have a greater impact at other times of the year. Therefore, I am unconvinced on the basis of this evidence that the proposal would not have a detrimental impact direct sunlight or on the levels of daylight to habitable rooms in the neighbouring dwellings.
8. Consequently, based on all I have seen and read, the proposal would cause harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring properties. On that basis I conclude, on this main issue, that the proposal does not accord with Policy 10 of the of the Aligned Core Strategies Part 1 Local Plan (2014) (ACS) or Policies LPD32 and LPD43 of the Local Planning Document Part 2 Local Plan (2018) (LPD). Amongst other things, these policies require that development does not cause any significant adverse effect on the living conditions of nearby residents and occupiers.

Character and Appearance

9. Pilkington Road is residential in character and comprises dwellings which vary in terms of their scale and appearance. There is a mix of single, two and three storey detached properties of varying designs and heights above road level. The split-level character of the host dwelling adds to that mix.
10. The proposed increase in the ridge height would result in a building height comparable to that of the adjacent property No 10. I acknowledge the Council's concern that as a result of the increase in height, the proportions of the building would be altered. However, the appearance of the extended building in that respect would not be inappropriate and again would be similar to that of No 10. Moreover, the scale of the building considered as a whole would reflect others in the street.
11. The proposed half-hip roof form, designed to reduce the impact of the development on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers, is not a current feature of the building and I am not aware there are any other dwellings with such a roof form in the street. However, this limited change would not be harmful to the appearance of the building, particularly given its already irregular form and appearance. Moreover, the building, like its neighbours, is set in an elevated position above the road. Accordingly, the roof form would not be readily apparent in the street scene, and given that there is no particular building style to follow, would not be harmful to the character or appearance of the area.

12. No objection has been raised by the Council to the alterations to the garage or to the rear dormer in terms of their scale or design. I have no reason to disagree.
13. I conclude on this issue that the proposal would not harm the character or appearance of the host dwelling or the street scene. On that basis it would not conflict with Policy 10 of the ACS or Policy LPD43 of the LPD, which seek, amongst other things, to ensure that development is keeping with the surrounding character and appearance of the area.
14. The Council further refers to Policy LPD32 of the LPD in its reason for refusal on character and appearance. However, this policy relates to factors affecting the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties, and has no relevance to the effect of a scheme on the character and appearance of an area.

Other Matters

15. I acknowledge the appellant's private reasons for wanting to extend the property, including for the care of an elderly relative. This matter carries limited weight in support of the scheme. However, it does not outweigh the harm identified above and does not therefore indicate that the appeal should be allowed.

Conclusion

16. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

D Ellis

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

17. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

S Ashworth

INSPECTOR