
Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 19 October 2021

by John Gunn DipTP, DipDBE, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 December 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/N3020/W/21/3277817

64 Ernest Road, Carlton, NG4 1LZ

- 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 Lee Davies against the decision of Gedling Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2020/0965, dated 21 September 2020, was refused by notice dated 14 June 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as 'Ground floor extension to extend office space. One bedroom apartment on top of existing garage accessed from external staircase'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. 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 a ground floor extension to office. The Council dealt with the proposal on this basis and so shall I.
3. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published in July 2021, the main parties have been given an opportunity to comment on its provisions in regard to the appeal. I have taken any responses into account and referred to the Framework in my decision.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site lies in a predominantly residential area where Ernest Road and Prospect Road cross. The area is characterised by semi-detached and detached dwellings, set back a modest distance from the highway, with well defined 'building lines' to both roads. A limited pallet of materials and roof styles define the character of the area.
6. The proposed extension would be sited close to the footway with Prospect Road, in an elevated position, and would be prominent in the street scene given this. It would be positioned well forward of No 91 Prospect Road resulting in a building that would be visually dominant within the streetscene, the harm of which would be exacerbated by the largely solid side and rear elevations, which would be particularly prominent from Prospect Road. Moreover, the

proposed development would incorporate a hipped roof with a low pitch which would be incompatible with the design of the host property, which has a gabled roof, and other properties in the vicinity of the site which have hipped roofs with steep pitches.

7. Accordingly, I conclude that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area, in conflict with Policy 10 of the Broxtowe Borough, Gedling Borough, Nottingham City Aligned Core Strategies Part 1 Local Plan which requires developments, amongst other matters, to be designed to make a positive contribution to the public realm and sense of place, creating an attractive environment that reinforces valued local characteristics. It is in broad conformity with the National Planning Policy Framework, which states that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development. While I note that the appellant states that the proposal would create a better place for them and their workforce to work, the proposal would not add to the overall quality of the area or be sympathetic to local character.
8. Policy LPD 43 of the Gedling Borough Local Planning Document Part 2 Local Plan has been included in the Council's decision notice and relates to extensions to dwellings not in the Green Belt. The proposal before me does not constitute an extension to a dwelling, and as such this policy is not relevant to the case before me.

Other Matters

9. The appellant has drawn my attention to a palisade fence that has been erected on the site. On my site visit I also noted a large metal container had been positioned on the site fronting Prospect Road. However, I have not been provided with any evidence regarding the planning status of these features. They do not provide justification for development that would fail to add to the overall quality of the area in the immediate vicinity of the appeal site.
10. I acknowledge that the proposed development would enable the appellants business to grow and expand, and that no objections have been received from local residents. However, these matters do not outweigh the significant harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area that I have identified above.

Conclusion

11. There are no material considerations that indicate the application should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. For the reasons given above, I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

John Gunn

INSPECTOR