



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 July 2022

by M Russell BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8th August 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/N3020/W/22/3291839

43 Ravenswood Road, Arnold, Nottingham, Nottinghamshire NG5 7FY

- 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 Daniel Ireland against the decision of Gedling Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2021/0650, dated 7 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 13 August 2021.
 - The development proposed is new 3 bedroomed semi-detached house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. Ravenswood Road is predominantly characterised by two-storey, semi-detached dwellings which are set back from front boundaries. No 43 Ravenswood Road is a semi-detached dwelling situated on a corner plot. Due to the sloped topography of Ravenswood Road, the semi-detached pair that No 43 forms part of is situated at a higher level than the semi-detached pair on the opposing corner. Even so there is symmetry between these semi-detached pairs in terms of their width, form, similarly angled alignment to the street and the generous spacing afforded between the dwellings and their respective boundaries with Leivers Avenue. These shared characteristics give consistency and order to the street scene and positively contribute to the area's pleasant residential character.
4. The bulk and form of the dwelling, in combination with its position close to the side boundary of the site, would significantly detract from the spacious arrangement and shared characteristics of the built environment at the junction of Ravenswood Road and Leivers Avenue. The cramped appearance of the proposal would be further emphasised by its elevated position relative to the opposing corner plot. The development would also appear conspicuous in views towards the rear elevation of the proposal on Leivers Avenue due to its projection substantially forward of the front elevations of other dwellings on the same side of this adjoining road. As a result, the proposal would be an unduly prominent and incongruous addition which would detract from the order, quality and consistency of the immediate street scene.

5. My attention has been drawn to the layout of other developments in the local area on corner plots. Some of the examples provided were granted planning several years before the adoption of the current development plan. None are identical to site-specific context of the appeal proposal. Notably, the angle of the two-storey side extension at No 143 Ravenswood Road affords a more spacious layout in relation to its side boundary. With regards to the more recently approved developments at No 1 Nairn Close and No 30 Gleneagles Drive, those particular proposals related to areas characterised by rows of terraced dwellings and are not comparable to the pattern of development at the appeal site. In any case, the examples provided do not persuade me that the appeal proposal would positively respond to its immediate context.
6. I conclude, the proposal would have a significantly harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. In that regard, it would conflict with the design and local character requirements of Policy 10 (Design and Enhancing Local Identity) of the Greater Nottingham Aligned Core Strategies Part 1 Local Plan (2014) and Policies LPD 33 (Residential Density), LPD 34 (Residential Gardens) and LPD 40 (Housing Development on Unallocated Sites) of the Gedling Borough Local Planning Document Part 2 Local Plan (2018).

Other matter

7. The site is located in a sustainable location within the built-up area. I also acknowledge the Government objective to significantly boost the delivery of housing. However, the provision of a single dwelling does not override the requirements in the development plan or national policy for good design which positively responds to local character.

Conclusion

8. The proposal would have a significantly harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area and therefore conflicts with the development plan taken as a whole. There are no material considerations that indicate the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

M Russell

INSPECTOR