



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 June 2020 by L Wilson BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

Decision by Chris Preston BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 June 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/J3015/W/20/3246809

29 Dunsmore Close, Beeston NG9 1LU

- 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 Mrs Nicolle Straight against the decision of Broxtowe Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 19/00479/FUL, dated 26 July 2019, was refused by notice dated 23 September 2019.
 - The development proposed is demolition of double garage (panel construction) and construction of one two storey detached dwelling.
-

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.

Preliminary Matters

3. Since making its decision, the Council has adopted the Broxtowe Part 2 Local Plan 2019 (the 'LP'). Policy 17 referred to in the Council's reason for refusal is therefore now adopted. The Council has confirmed that the Broxtowe Local Plan 2004 has been superseded, and that Policy H7 is no longer relevant. I have considered the appeal accordingly. The adoption of the LP is confirmed in the Council's statement, and the appellant has had the opportunity to respond at final comments stage.
4. For clarity, I have taken the appellant's name from the appeal form. I have used the spelling of the appellant's name from the application form which is consistent with other documents, including the decision notice and final comments document.

Main Issue

5. The effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

6. No. 29 is a two-storey end of terrace house. The appeal site is situated on a prominent corner plot at the junction between Dunsmore Close and Longlands

- Road. The new detached dwelling would replace the existing detached double garage located towards the rear of No. 29.
7. The surrounding area is characterised by similar terraces. The terraces have strong building lines and gable roofs. The simple form of the dwellings and the planned and regulated layout of the estate are key elements which give the estate its character. Properties are generally set back from the highway, behind either a driveway or small front garden, and the main garden is located the rear. The proposed dwelling would project in front of the building line of terrace No. 27-29 by approximately 2 metres. Due to the constraints of the site, the dwelling would be adjacent to the highway, and the parking area and garden would be situated to the side of the property. At its closest point, the proposed dwelling would be approximately 0.5m from Longlands Road. The new dwelling would therefore be a dominant addition to the street scene.
 8. The appearance of the dwelling would not reflect that of the surrounding area. The proposal would contrast with the area because the area is not characterised by detached dwellings nor hipped roofs. The terraces have a simple appearance with a broadly square footprint. The proposed dwelling would be an 'L' shape and would have a higher finished floor level than properties within the street scene. Due to the finished floor level, the eaves height would be approximately 1 metre higher and the roof ridge would be approximately 0.5m higher than the surrounding properties.
 9. The configuration, design and height of the proposed window and door openings would also be noticeably different to the terraces. To the front of the site is a mature boundary hedge which would only screen a small proportion of the scheme because of the scale and massing of the proposed dwelling. Accordingly, as a result of its scale, siting and design, the scheme would appear at odds with the simple style of the surrounding terraces.
 10. The Council are concerned that the garden size would also be out of character. From the highway, the main garden spaces are generally screened by properties. Garden sizes therefore are not a key visual characteristic of the locality. Whilst the garden area would be more disjointed than the surrounding properties, this would not, in itself, be a reason to withhold planning permission.
 11. The appellant asserts that the scheme is similar to other approved planning applications in the local area, including No. 5 Dunsmore Close (No. 5), No. 7 Thorndyke Close (No. 7) and No. 163 Trent Road (No. 163). I visited these sites on my site visit.
 12. Both No. 7 and No. 163 relate to extensions to existing residential properties rather than a detached dwelling. Whilst the extension at No. 7 does include a hipped roof, the site is less prominent, and the extension is stepped in from the boundary. Furthermore, the application was approved approximately 30 years ago prior to the current national and local planning policy. The extension at No. 163 is set back from the principal elevation and the roof ridge is set down to ensure that it reads as a subordinate addition.
 13. The new dwelling, at No. 5, had not been built when I visited the site. In any event, the submitted drawings show that whilst the approved dwelling is detached and the eaves and ridge height are similar to the appeal scheme, it

follows the front and rear building line of No. 5 and has a gable roof. The appeal scheme thus cannot be directly compared to these approvals.

14. For these reasons, I find that the proposal would have a harmful impact upon the character and appearance of the surrounding area. Consequently, it would conflict with Policy 10 of the Broxtowe Borough Aligned Core Strategies Part 1 Local Plan (2014), Policy 17 of the LP and the National Planning Policy Framework. These Policies seek, amongst other matters, to promote good design and to ensure new development integrates with their surroundings.

Other Matters

15. The appellant asserts that the scheme would help address the undersupply of housing within the local area. The Council has highlighted that since they adopted the LP, they can demonstrate a five year housing land supply. Therefore, based on the evidence before me, and having regard to the 2019 Housing Delivery Test results, the Council is able to demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing land. In that context, and as the benefit to housing supply arising from one dwelling would be very modest, I afford very limited weight to this matter.
16. I note that the Highways Department did not object to the proposal, the internal floor area is compliant with the space standards, the scheme would provide limited economic benefits and make effective use of land in an accessible location. However, these considerations do not outweigh the harm identified above.

Conclusion and Recommendation

17. For the reasons given above I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

L M Wilson

APPEALS PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

18. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report, and, on that basis, I agree and conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Chris Preston

INSPECTOR