



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 September 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: 22 September 2020**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/Q3060/D/20/3256757**

**15 Bexleigh Gardens, Nottingham NG8 3EL**

- 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 Amjad Sabir against the decision of Nottingham City Council.
  - The application Ref 20/00212/PFUL3, dated 31 January 2020, was refused by notice dated 19 May 2020.
  - The development proposed was described on the application form as conversion of garage into residential accommodation, raising the roof of existing garage, extending existing garage, constructing a dormer on garage and construction two storey link between main house and garage.
- 

### 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. Notwithstanding the description of development set out above, which is taken from the application form, it is clear from the plans and accompanying details that the development comprises the conversion of the garage into residential accommodation, raising the roof and extending the garage, and constructing a two-storey link between the main house and the garage conversion. The Council dealt with the proposal on this basis and so shall I.

### Main Issue

4. The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area.

### Reasons for the Recommendation

5. No. 15 is a detached, two-storey dwelling which is located on a prominent corner plot within a residential area. The street scene is largely characterised by detached dwellings which are regularly spaced. Properties, including No. 15, generally have a simple appearance with a hipped roof. The configuration of the appeal site differs to the surrounding properties as a result of it being a corner plot. No. 15 currently has a detached double garage to the rear of the

- dwelling. In contrast most properties within the area have integral garages or adjoining garages to the side.
6. The Council raised no objection to the proposed two-storey extension, and I have no reason to disagree with that assessment. The Council's main objection relates to the alterations to the garage. The scheme has been revised and includes a mansard style roof, with tiles that match the appeal property. The converted garage would create habitable space including two bedrooms within the new first floor.
  7. Although the converted garage would have a lower ridge height than the proposed two-storey extension and existing property, the roof design would appear out of keeping with the host property and surrounding area. The scheme would significantly alter the appearance of the property and increase its scale and massing. The design of the converted garage would result in an unusually elongated dwelling and introduce a roof form which does not reflect the hipped roof of the original property. The proposed roof would appear 'top heavy' on account of the height, depth and width of the flat roof element and would result in a somewhat contrived appearance stemming from the desire to squeeze living accommodation at first floor level above a limited footprint. The proposed porch would also add a further roof element. Thus, the scheme would be inconsistent with the simple architectural style of the original dwelling.
  8. The flat roof element of the proposed mansard roof would not be conspicuous when approaching the dwelling from either Bexleigh Gardens or Aspley Park Drive. The existing boundary treatment would also partially screen the development from these viewpoints. However, the design would be evident from Glencairn Drive and would appear at odds with the street scene. It would draw the eye because mansard roofs are not present within the area and it would result in an alien feature. The use of prominent double roof lights would also appear out of place. Although the converted garage would have the appearance of an annexe, such buildings are not prevalent from the highway. Accordingly, the scheme would compromise the character and appearance of the host property and area on account of its design, siting, scale and massing.
  9. I observed on my site visit that a large proportion of dwellings have been extended. The design of these extensions varies, there are examples of poorly designed two-storey extensions with flat roofs, no set back and roof ridge the same height as the original dwelling. However, the scheme before me would be more conspicuous than these extensions as a result of the sites corner plot prominence and due to the extent of built development being proposed.
  10. The appellant has drawn my attention to No. 38 Aspley Park which relates to a recently approved extension to a corner plot. I visited No. 38 on my site visit and observed that building work had commenced. Although the approved extension, at No. 38, would significantly enlarge the property it cannot be directly compared to the scheme before me. The development at No. 38 relates to a larger plot, and it would maintain the general form of the original dwelling, the gap between the dwelling and garage would be maintained and the design would not appear unduly out of character. In any case, each application must be determined on its individual merits.
  11. For these reasons, the proposed development would be visually harmful to the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area. Consequently, the scheme would conflict with Policy 10 of the Broxtowe

Borough, Gedling Borough, Nottingham City Aligned Core Strategies Part 1 Local Plan (2014) and Policy DE1 of the Nottingham City land and planning policies Development Plan Document: Local Plan Part 2 (2020). These policies collectively seek, amongst other matters, to promote a high standard of design through ensuring new development respects and enhances the character of an area.

### **Conclusion and Recommendation**

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

*L M Wilson*

APPEALS PLANNING OFFICER

### **Inspector's Decision**

13. 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