



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 January 2021

by Paul Cooper MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 January 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/N3020/D/20/3259078

12 Ploughman Avenue, Woodborough, Nottingham NG14 6DE

- 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 Pauline Townsend against the decision of Gedling Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2020/0461, dated 18 May 2020, was refused by notice dated 21 August 2020.
 - The development proposed is increase ridge height of dwelling and loft conversion with internal and external alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues in this case are the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the Woodborough Conservation Area and the effect of the development on the living conditions of nearby residents.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The appeal property is a single storey dwelling in a residential area of mixed dwelling types.
4. The proposal is to increase part of the roof height of the dwelling by approximately 1.4m in order to provide first floor accommodation and would include the insertion of windows and roof lights.
5. The road on which the appeal proposal is sited slopes upward from the main road. As a result of this, and the variations in detailing between dwellings, the roof ridges are not exactly at the same level. Nonetheless there is a broad consistency in the single storey dwellings, but there are some two storey dwellings located at the head of the road.
6. The proposals would make the existing dwelling appear dominant within the locality and appear out of place within the stretch of single storey dwellings. The design would appear at odds and markedly increase the amount of walling with the structure to the detriment of the character and appearance of the area. Whilst there are two storey dwellings at the head of the road, the appeal property is not seen within that context, but as part of the single storey development. As such I find that the proposals cause harm to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

7. The Woodborough Conservation Area has a linear form that has been dictated by local topography and has a number of views and vistas including St Swithuns Church.
8. Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires that special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the Conservation Area
9. Whilst I have identified harm to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, the proposal would result in less than substantial harm to the Conservation Area. In accordance with Paragraph 196 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), less than substantial harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.
10. The appellant has forwarded a number of personal circumstances as to why the development is suitable but these are specific to the appellant and cannot be considered to be wider public benefits and therefore do not outweigh the harm that I have identified to the Conservation Area.
11. In conclusion on this issue, I therefore find that the proposals are contrary to Policies 10 and 11 of the Gedling Borough Council Aligned Core Strategy (2014) (the ACS) and Policies LPD26, LPD28 and LPD43 of the Local Planning Document (2018) (the LPD) which amongst other matters expect development to reinforce valued local characteristics, be of appropriate design and scale and be in keeping with surrounding character in terms of height, built form and general design.

Living conditions

12. I note that the adjacent property (no 10) is at a lower site level than the appeal property, but that it is located to the south of that property. As a result, I do not consider that the appeal proposals would overshadow the adjacent dwelling to any significant degree, or that the design would lead to overlooking of the dwelling or private amenity space. It would not appear overbearing to a level that I could find significant harm to the living conditions of the residents of that property, despite the close relationship between the two properties in terms of siting near the respective boundaries.
13. As a result, on this issue, I find that the proposals are consistent with policy 10 of the ACS and Policies LPD32 and LPD43 of the LPD which amongst other matters assess development on the impact of nearby residents or occupiers.

Other Matters

14. I have had regard to the appellants personal circumstances, and the work that has been done to other properties nearby. However, I have not been supplied with details of these schemes and I am assessing the appeal proposals on their own merit. Both issues do not outweigh the harm that I have identified.

Conclusion

15. Therefore, for the reasons given above, and taking into account all other matters, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Paul Cooper INSPECTOR