



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 7 September 2021

by J Williamson BSc (Hons) MPlan MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 04 October 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/N3020/D/21/3276987

241 Mansfield Road, Arnold NG5 8LS

- 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 Peter Gill against the decision of Gedling Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2020/1267, dated 16 December 2020, was refused by notice dated 22 March 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as demolish existing garages and erect triple garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Application for costs

2. An application for an award of costs was made by Mr Peter Gill, against Gedling Borough Council. This application will be the subject of a separate Decision.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the host dwelling, neighbouring dwellings and the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The host property, number 241 Mansfield Road, is a relatively large, detached dwelling comprised of a two-storey core section with a dual-pitched, hipped roof, and single storey flat roof extensions to both sides and rear, plus a flat roof two storey extension to the rear. The property is sited within a relatively large plot, though most of the outdoor space is located between the main road and the front of the dwelling.
5. The host dwelling is one of 2 relatively large, detached dwellings located either side of the eastern end of Birch Lea, a cul-de-sac comprising of half a dozen detached dwellings made up of single storey, one-and-a-half storey, and two storey properties. The host property is set well back from Mansfield Road and oriented at an angle of around 45 degrees to it.
6. I appreciate that the footprint of the proposed building would not have a significantly greater footprint than the combined footprints of the 2 outbuildings to be demolished. However, the proposed building, which would have a room in the roof, would be significantly wider and higher than either of these single storey buildings and deeper than the smallest of the 2. This would result in the proposal having a significantly greater mass than the combined mass of the 2 buildings to be demolished.

7. The southern elevation of the proposal would be sited a similar distance from the side of the dwelling to that of the existing double garage. However, given the width, height and mass of the proposed building and the limited gap that would remain between the northern elevation of the proposal and the northern boundary, I consider the proposed building would appear cramped between the side elevation of the dwelling and the boundary wall.
8. Additionally, the building would have a large front gable with a solid appearance, in contrast with the glazed fenestration breaking up the mass of the front of the existing dwelling. The eaves would be positioned below the eaves/parapet of the single storey section at the side of the existing dwelling, and the ridge height would be much higher than the roof of the single storey side extension. I appreciate that the host dwelling is much larger than the proposed building. However, due to the proposed siting, size, mass and design features of the proposed building outlined above, I conclude that the proposal would have an uncomfortable and unbalanced relationship with, and a detrimental impact upon, the host dwelling.
9. Figure 1 of the appellant's Grounds of Appeal indicates that the detached timber building that has already been demolished had the appearance of a garden shed, relatively modest in size, constructed of lightweight materials, and tucked away in the north western corner of the plot. The photograph also indicates that both outbuildings would previously not have been visible when stood on Birch Lea in-line with the buildings, due to the hedge that was present. The existing double garage also has a low ridge height and a very shallow pitched roof.
10. The eastern boundaries of numbers 241 and 243 Mansfield Road comprise of hedges and trees, and the entrance to Birch Lea has large stone/concrete pillars either side of it. I acknowledge that these features restrict views of the site from Mansfield Road. However, in contrast with the existing situation, there would be a large gable facing the Birch Lea entrance and a large expanse of roof that would project above the northern side boundary wall of the site, directly facing Birch Lea. As such, the proposal would be very prominent in the Birch Lea street scene, clearly visible from the point of entry onto Birch Lea and up to the point just beyond the western boundary of the site. I therefore conclude that the proposal would be harmful to the street scene and therefore the appearance of the area.
11. Due to the boundary treatment along the western boundary of the site and the immediate neighbouring property on Birch Lea, plus the varied designs and sizes of properties on Birch Lea and within the surrounding area, I consider the proposed building would not be overbearing on, or compete in scale with, the neighbouring properties.
12. Notwithstanding my conclusion regarding the effect of the proposal on neighbouring properties, for the reasons outlined, I consider the proposal does not accord with Policy 10 of the Broxtowe Borough, Gedling Borough, Nottingham City Aligned Core Strategies Part 1 Local Plan (2014), Policy 43 of the Gedling Borough Local Planning Document Part 2 Local Plan (2018), or design policies outlined in the National Planning Policy Framework. Collectively, and among other things, these policies require development to be well designed, visually attractive and in keeping with the surrounding area, taking account of aspects such as massing, scale and proportion.

Other Matters

13. The appellant contends that he was not given the opportunity to discuss the concerns the Council had with the proposal nor was he given the opportunity to make any amendments. This matter is dealt with in the costs Decision, and it is a matter that does not alter the outcome of this appeal.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons outlined above, I conclude that the appeal is dismissed.

J Williamson

INSPECTOR