



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 December 2021

by Hannah Ellison BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 December 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/Q3060/W/21/3280117

2 Sedgewood Grove, Nottingham NG11 8FP

- 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 Miss Trudy Lovatt against the decision of Nottingham City Council.
 - The application Ref 21/00114/PFUL3, dated 18 January 2021, was refused by notice dated 16 March 2021.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a 2 bedroomed dwelling with parking - resubmission of application 19/02644/PFUL3.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The effect of the proposal on a) the character and appearance of the area and b) the living conditions of occupiers at 2 Sedgewood Grove, with particular regard to outlook and light.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The appeal site comprises the side garden of 2 Sedgewood Grove, which is a two storey end of terrace dwelling on a large corner plot. The surrounding locality predominantly consists of pairs and rows of two storey properties of a similar design, scale and massing, with largely unbroken and consistent rooflines. There is therefore a strong order and uniformity to the immediate area which contributes positively to its character and appearance.
4. Although it has been designed to be subordinate to No 2, the proposed dwelling would significantly interrupt the rhythm of the wider terrace due to its lower eaves and ridge line, gabled roof and set back position. Its incongruous design, siting, scale and massing would be readily apparent from the public realm and it would therefore appear as an intrusive addition that would fail to reflect or relate well to No 2 and the wider terrace. Accordingly, it would erode the established pattern of development in the locality.
5. The referenced examples of extensions on corner plots are subordinate developments that are in keeping with the character of the host property and the wider area in each case. I do not have the full details of the example at 107 Colley Moor Leys Lane and did not observe a detached new build on that site thus cannot make a direct and fully reasoned comparison with the appeal

scheme. These examples do not therefore change my findings on this main issue.

6. Consequently, the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the area and would conflict with Policy 10 of the Greater Nottingham, Broxtowe Borough, Gedling Borough, Nottingham City, Aligned Core Strategies, Part 1 Local Plan (September 2014) (the ACS) and Policies DE1 and DE2 of the Nottingham City, Land and Planning Policies, Development Plan Document, Local Plan Part 2 (January 2020) (the LAPP). Collectively they seek to ensure that buildings are appropriately designed and reinforce, respect and enhance local characteristics, amongst other matters.

Living Conditions

7. The proposed dwelling would extend along the shared boundary with No 2 by a considerable amount and it would be of a substantial overall height, irrespective of the angle of the proposed roof. By virtue of its scale, projection and close relationship, together with the north west facing rear garden of No 2, the proposed dwelling would be overbearing and significantly enclose and overshadow the rear garden of No 2, causing it to be an unpleasant space for its occupiers.
8. The proposed development would therefore harm the living conditions of occupiers at No 2, with particular regard to outlook and light, and thus would conflict with Policy 10 of the ACS and Policy DE1 of the LAPP which seek to ensure that developments provide a satisfactory level of amenity for neighbouring residents.

Conclusion

9. The proposal would provide an additional home which would bring some accompanying benefits associated with the investment and employment during construction, and from the spending in the local area from future occupiers. The nature of these benefits would however be limited due to the small scale of the development, thus I afford them limited weight.
10. The proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area and the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers, harm which would lead to conflict with the development plan and to which I afford substantial weight. There are no material considerations worthy of sufficient weight that indicate a decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan, therefore the appeal should be dismissed.

H Ellison
INSPECTOR