
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 March 2020

by Andrew McGlone BSc MCD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 March 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Q3060/D/19/3239579
34 Belper Road, Nottingham NG7 6AE

- 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 Ms Karen Davison against the decision of City of Nottingham Council.
 - The application Ref 19/01734/PFUL3, dated 6 August 2019, was refused by notice dated 3 October 2019.
 - The development proposed is external wall insulation. Change of existing facade material from painted brick to textured render in colour to match existing.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. I have, for completeness, used the appellant's full name which is set out on the appeal form in my decision.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the appeal property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a three storey end terraced corner property within a Primary Residential Area of the City. The front door of the property addresses Belper Road, while the Maples Street elevation contains a ground floor bay window. As with neighbouring properties in the terraces that line Belper Road and Maples Street, the appeal property is constructed from brick. In the case of the appeal property, the brickwork has been painted off white, save for the third floor of the rear elevation. The property has a skirt at its base which is painted black along with teardrop brick detailing at the eaves, arched soldier courses over the entrance door and windows, window sills and arched mouldings over each opening, and a string course at first and second floor sill levels. While there is some variation in the finish of these, they are found throughout the terraces on Belper Road and Maples Street.
5. Although the appeal property is not a heritage asset, the architectural features evident on the property and the terraces form part of the area's local distinctiveness. Even if the property's architectural detailing could benefit from maintenance and or repair, it still positively contributes to the overall cohesive

appearance of the terraces which the appeal property forms a part of.

6. I have no reason to doubt that the proposal would improve the thermal efficiency of the appeal property. The two string courses would remain legible due to the proposed double layer of insulation, and the skirt would be insulated and painted black. However, the proposal would alter the existing distinctive teardrop detailing at the eaves due to the thickness of the proposed insulation, and result in the loss of the arches over the windows and door. The property's elevations would also extend marginally outwards due to the thickness of the proposed insulation. The effect of this would not be adverse on the Belper Road frontage due to the intervening gap to the terrace at the rear. However, the change on the Maples Street elevation would take the elevation beyond that of the adjoining terrace. This would in tandem with the loss of some of the other features emphasise the uneasy contrast between the appeal property and the cohesive architecture and appearance of the remainder of the terrace.
7. This decision requires a judgement to be reached based on the site's particular circumstances. I recognise the appellant's point about the use of internal insulation, and while the proposal would be designed to adapt to meeting changing needs of occupiers and the effects of climate change, the Government is clear that the creation of high quality buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve.
8. The appellant is willing to accept a planning condition so that the mouldings and features on the property are retained. This approach may overcome the concerns identified, but there is no wording before me of such a condition. However, even if there was, I am not certain, based on the detail that is before me, that a condition could be drafted with sufficient precision to enable the dual design requirements of the scheme to be mutually satisfied. Hence, the proposal would not set an acceptable precedent for other similar terraced properties in the area.
9. Therefore, I conclude that the proposed development would adversely affect the character and appearance of the appeal property and the surrounding area. Consequently, the proposal would not accord with Policy 10 of the Aligned Core Strategies Part 1 Local Plan which seeks development to be assessed in terms of local context and its treatment of materials, architectural style and detailing.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal is dismissed.

Andrew McGlone

INSPECTOR