



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 22 November 2021

by Zoe Raygen DipURP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 December 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/Q3060/W/21/3277257

54 Mapperley Road, NOTTINGHAM NG3 5AS

- 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 Glenoak Property Investment Ltd against the decision of Nottingham City Council.
 - The application Ref 20/02764/PFUL3, dated 22 December 2020, was refused by notice dated 24 March 2021.
 - The development proposed is conversion of a 6 Bedroom C3 Dwelling to 3 No. C3 Dwellings (1 x 4 Bedroom Family Dwelling and 2x 2 Bedroom Apartments) and associated internal and external alterations including two small rear dormers.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for the conversion of a 6 Bedroom C3 Dwelling to 3 No. C3 Dwellings (1 x 4 Bedroom Family Dwelling and 2x 2 Bedroom Apartments) and associated internal and external alterations including two small rear dormers at 54 Mapperley Road, NOTTINGHAM NG3 5AS in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 20/02764/PFUL3, dated 22 December 2020, subject to the conditions set out below.
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be begun within 3 years from the date of this permission.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 862 001, 862 002, 862 003, 862 004F, 862 005F, 862 006C.
 - 3) No development shall commence until there shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority a scheme of landscaping for the front garden. All planting, seeding or turfing comprised in the approved details of landscaping shall be carried out in the first planting and seeding seasons following the occupation of the buildings or the completion of the development, whichever is the sooner; and any trees or plants which within a period of 5 years from the completion of the development die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species.

Preliminary Matter

2. As the proposal is in a conservation area, I have had special regard to sections 66(1) and 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act).

Main Issue

3. The main issues are:

- the effect of the proposal on the achievement and maintenance of balanced communities with particular regard to family dwellings; and
- whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Mapperley Park and Alexandra Park Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

Balanced communities

4. The appeal property forms a six bedroom semi-detached house set over five floors including a basement. The proposal is to convert the property to one four bedroom dwelling and two, two bedroom apartments.
5. The Greater Nottingham Aligned Core Strategies Part 1 Local Plan 2014 (the Core Strategy) outlines how Nottingham has a lower percentage of family housing than the other authorities within Greater Nottingham. The City Council's Housing Strategy 2008-2011 says that 'the provision of more homes suitable and attractive to families is a key priority' and that 'the imbalance is particularly acute in larger homes of 4 or more bedrooms and the provision of these larger homes is a particular priority'.
6. As a result, Policy 8 of the Core Strategy requires that there should be an emphasis on providing family housing, including larger family housing, to meet Sustainable Community Strategy and Housing Strategy objectives. This is generally supported by Policy HO1 of the Nottingham City Land and Planning Policies Development Plan Document Local Plan Part 2 (2020) (LPP2) regarding Housing Mix. Policy HO2 of the LPP2 includes a presumption against the loss of dwellinghouses for family occupation through either sub-division or conversion unless one of six criteria is met.
7. While the proposal would lead to the loss of a six bedroom family house, it would incorporate a four bedroom house, the provision of which is considered to be a priority in the Council's Housing Strategy. Furthermore, the appellant refers to the more recent Housing Strategy 2018-2021 which confirms the need for the Council to secure more family housing, and in particular larger family homes. Within the document family housing is considered to be of no more than three storeys, have private enclosed gardens and have three or more bedrooms, two at least of which are capable of double occupancy. The proposal would meet this definition, and this is not disputed by the Council.
8. Although the garden space isn't large to the rear of the property, it would be private and provide sufficient room for a sitting out and play area. Furthermore, the location of the entrance at the rear of the property, would not, in my view, be such a negative factor to prevent the accommodation being used as a family dwelling. I therefore consider that overall, the proposal would not result in the loss of a family house, the provision of which the Council considers a priority.
9. For the reasons above, I conclude that the proposal would not have a harmful effect on the Council's aim to achieve and maintain balanced communities with

particular regard to family dwellings. There would therefore be no conflict with Policy 8 of the Core Strategy and Policies HO1 and HO2 of the LPP2.

Conservation Area

10. Mapperley Park and Alexandra Park developed as an exclusive suburb for the Edwardian middle classes. There are a range of styles of architecture and many properties retain their original features being set back from the road behind stone walls. Streets are typically tree lined with planting in front gardens giving a verdant quality to the CA. Therefore, the significance of the CA, in so far as it relates to this appeal, is the high quality architecture and its relationship to the street and planting.
11. The appeal property is part of a row of large semi-detached buildings retaining most of its original features, set back from the road behind a stone wall enclosing a small front garden with some planting. It therefore contributes positively to the significance of the CA.
12. One of the Council's concerns relates to the installation of a lightwell at the front of the property. It considers this would be an alien feature, which would remove a substantial amount of the front garden and be visual prominent, unbalancing the frontage of the two attached properties.
13. I saw that one of the other properties in the row within which the appeal site is located has a small lightwell, so the proposal would not be an entirely alien feature. It would though be a new feature to the front elevation of the host building and would alter its appearance. However, due to the presence of the boundary wall, planting elsewhere in the street and the incline in the road, views of the lightwell would be limited both in isolation and when viewed with the attached property. Furthermore, while the garden space would be reduced, there would still be sufficient space to enable a degree of planting which would be characteristic of the CA. The integrity of the property itself, together with its architectural detailing would not be harmed. I therefore am of the view that there would be no harm to the significance of the CA and its character and appearance would be preserved.
14. The Mapperley Park and Alexandra Park Conservation Area Character Appraisal and Management Plan states that proposals for the change of use of houses to flatted accommodation will be resisted where it would result in the loss of single family accommodation due to the increased demands for on-site car parking and bin storage to the detriment of the character and appearance of the CA.
15. The proposal here would result in a marginal increase in the requirement for car parking spaces which would be accommodated on the roadside. The Council confirm that there are no on street parking restrictions and not a significant parking problem in the area. I found this to be the case at my site visit. Consequently, there would be no need for on-site parking, and this is not part of the proposal. Bin storage would be accommodated at the rear of the property and therefore the character and appearance of the CA in these respects would be preserved.
16. The Council raises no other concerns regarding alterations to the property including the rear dormers. From the evidence before me, and my observations on site, I see no reason to disagree.

17. For the reasons above, I conclude that the proposal would preserve the character and appearance of the Mapperley Park and Alexandra Park Conservation Area thus satisfying the requirements of the Act and policies 10 and 11 of the Core Strategy and policies DE1 and HE1 of the LPP2. Together these require, amongst other things, that development respects and enhances townscape and character of an area and conserves heritage assets in line with their interest and significance.

Conditions

18. In the interests of certainty, it is appropriate that there is a condition requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans. A condition requiring a landscaping scheme for the front garden is necessary to protect the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

19. For the reasons above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Zoe Raygen

INSPECTOR