



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 July 2020 by Darren Ellis MPlan

Decision by K Taylor BSc (Hons) PGDip MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 September 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/N3020/W/20/3248231

133 - 137 Breck Hill Road, Mapperley, Nottingham NG3 5JP

- 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 A. Muldoon and S. Osborne against the decision of Gedling Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2019/1170, dated 18 December 2019, was refused by notice dated 2 March 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as two dwellings and proposed rear extension (ground and first floor) at No. 133.
-

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.

Procedural Matter

3. The Council's officer report states that the assessment and decision was based on the following drawings: Proposed Floor Plans drawing no. 2006.042.006 revision H; Proposed Block Plan drawing no. 2006.042.002 revision K; Proposed Elevations drawing no. 2006.042.007 revision D; and Existing and Proposed Street Scene drawing no. 2006.042.008 revision N. The appellant had submitted further revised drawings, however these were not the subject of the Council's assessment and decision. I will therefore refer to the drawings named above in this appeal.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are:
 - the effect of the two proposed dwellings on the character and appearance of the area; and
 - whether the development would provide adequate provision for car parking.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal site forms an area of land in between Nos 133 and 137 Breck Hill Road. The site is in a residential area that comprises predominantly of
-

detached properties. Permission is sought for a two-storey rear extension at No 133 and to erect two new detached dwellings in the space between Nos 133 and 137.

6. Since the original application was determined, an amended application was submitted and approved¹ for the extension at No 133 and two new dwellings. The amendments involved an increase in the spacing between the two proposed dwellings and alterations to the roofs, eaves levels and front elevations of the new dwellings. The proposed extension to No 133 was unaltered in the amended scheme, and as this extension now has planning permission this appeal will focus solely on the two proposed new dwellings.

Character and appearance of the area

7. The site is currently an open area in between two detached properties. The properties in the area are of varying designs but have a modest separation to the adjacent properties which creates a moderate degree of spaciousness to the street scene. The proposed dwellings would maintain a modest gap to No 137, however the gap between the proposed dwellings and No 133 and between the proposed dwellings themselves would be small, resulting in a cramped appearance. The proposal would therefore be detrimental to the spacious character of the area.
8. The proposed width of the new dwellings and the front-facing gables would be in keeping with No 133. However, the proposed dwellings would have asymmetrical roofs and glazing at the second-floor level of the gables, which are features that are at odds with the existing properties surrounding the appeal site. Furthermore, the proposed fenestration at the second-floor level in the front gable would not align with the fenestration below.
9. For these reasons, the proposed dwellings would be incongruous in the street scene and consequently would detract from the character and appearance of the area. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policy 10 of the Aligned Core Strategies (2014) (ACS) and Policies LPD32, LPD34 and LPD40 of the Local Planning Document (2018) (LPD). These policies all seek in various ways for development to be of a high standard of design that does not adversely affect the area by reason of its scale or form.
10. The reason for refusal on the decision notice that relates to the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area also refers to Policies 2 (The Spatial Strategy) and 8 (Housing Size, Mix and Choice) of the ACS and Policies LPD33 (Residential Density) and LPD37 (Housing Type, Size and Tenure) of the LPD. However, these policies make no reference to the effect of a development on the character and appearance of the area and therefore are not relevant in this matter.

Car Parking

11. The submitted proposed block plan shows that two off-street parking spaces would be provided for the two proposed dwellings, one car parking space for each house. During the original application, concerns were raised by the Highway Authority that the proposed quantity of off-street parking would be insufficient and regarding the access to the parking area, with a tree in front of the site preventing a required extension to the existing dropped kerb. However,

¹ Planning application ref. 2020/0294

I note that for the recently approved scheme, which has the same parking layout as the proposal before me, that the Highway Authority and the Nottinghamshire County Council Forestry Officer were satisfied that the addition to the dropped kerb could be provided closer to the tree. I further note that the Council considered the amount of off-street parking to be acceptable given the proximity of the site to the shops and services on Plains Road and to the bus stops on Breck Hill Road and Plains Road. Based on the evidence before me I have no reason to disagree with this assessment, and therefore conclude that the proposal would make a suitable provision for car parking.

12. Consequently, the proposal would accord with Policy LPD57 of the LPD, which requires development proposals to meet the requirement for parking provision set out in Appendix D of the LPD or otherwise agreed by the local planning authority.

Other Matters

13. The proposal would provide two additional units of accommodation and therefore the development would, to a limited degree, boost the supply of housing. This is a benefit of the scheme which carries limited weight in support of the proposal.
14. The appellant states that the site is frequently targeted for vandalism, and that the proposal would consequently prevent this and would improve the visual appearance of the street. However, the recently approved dwellings would also achieve this aim if they were constructed, and no evidence has been submitted to suggest that these approved dwellings would not be constructed if this appeal was to fail. I therefore attach limited weight to the potential for the prevention of vandalism at the site.

Conclusion and recommendation

15. The benefits that would arise from the proposal would not outweigh the harm that would be caused to the character and appearance of the area. 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

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

K Taylor

INSPECTOR