The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 April 2021

by L Wilson BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 07 June 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/N3020/W/21/3266704
Fleurtations, 303 Westdale Lane, Mapperley, Nottinghamshire NG3 6EW

- 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 Graeme Wiser (G.B. Flowers) against the decision of Gedling Borough Council.
- The application Ref 2020/1010, dated 1 October 2020, was refused by notice dated 7 December 2020.
- The development proposed is ground floor shop and first floor flat extension.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site relates to a detached building located on a prominent corner plot at the junction of Westdale Lane and Blenheim Avenue. I understand that the host building is currently occupied by a florist with a flat located above. To the front of the building are parking spaces and to the side is a storage area enclosed by mesh fencing.

4. Blenheim Avenue is a residential street which has a broadly consistent building line with properties set back from the pavement behind driveways and small front gardens. Properties on corner plots, within the surrounding area, were designed so that they would respect the building line of both the front and return street.

5. The appeal proposal comprises a two-storey side extension. The extension would be in line with the building's principal elevation and its roof would be a continuation of the existing roof ridge. The extension would be marginally set in from the side boundary and would incorporate gable roof features to the front and side.

6. The proposed extension would erode the gap to the side boundary. The scheme would result in a dominant addition given its scale, siting and design. The extension would also substantially sit forward of the building line of Blenheim Avenue. This would result in the scheme having a poor relationship with Blenheim Avenue as it would fail to respect the established layout and building

line of the existing buildings which would be clearly evident due to the scale of the extension.

7. The appellant considers that the Council has been inconsistent in its decision as 339 Westdale Lane has a similar extension. Extremely limited information has been submitted with regards to that extension and therefore I cannot be certain that the circumstances are the same as the scheme before me. On my site visit I observed that properties situated on corner plots generally had gaps to the side boundary and respected the building line of the return street frontage. In any event, each application must be determined on its individual merits. The presence of other side extensions within the surrounding area does not represent justification for harmful development at the appeal site.

8. For these reasons, the proposed development would be visually harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area. Consequently, it would conflict with Policy 10 of the Greater Nottingham Aligned Core Strategies: Part 1 Local Plan and Policies 32 and 43 of the Gedling Borough Local Planning Document: Part 2 Local Plan which seek, amongst other matters, to ensure new development is in keeping with the surrounding character. It would also not comply with the National Planning Policy Framework which requires development to be sympathetic to local character.

Conclusion

9. The proposal would therefore conflict with the development plan and there are no other considerations that outweigh this conflict.

10. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

L M Wilson

INSPECTOR