



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 July 2022

by David Cross BA(Hons) PgDip(Dist) TechIOA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 August 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/X3025/W/22/3295386
204 Sutton Road, Mansfield NG18 5HL

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr David Parish against the decision of Mansfield District Council.
 - The application Ref 2021/0625/OUT, dated 10 August 2021, was refused by notice dated 24 November 2021.
 - The development proposed is a two storey detached one-bedroom dwelling with access off Lucknow Drive (after demolition of garage).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The application has been submitted in outline, with matters of access and layout sought for approval at this stage. I have determined this appeal on that basis.
3. The description of the development provided on the planning application form has been replaced by an amended version on the decision notice. I consider that subsequent description to accurately represent the proposal and I have therefore used it within this decision.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

5. The appeal site consists of the garden to the rear of 204 Sutton Road, although the site is viewed within the context of the cul-de-sac of Lucknow Drive.
6. Lucknow Drive includes a mixture of detached and semi-detached properties arranged around the head of the cul-de-sac. The appeal proposal would introduce a further detached dwelling and it may be possible to design a dwelling which complements the suburban character of other dwellings in the streetscape.
7. However, the proposed two storey dwelling would be located close to the rear elevation of No 204 and would be located directly adjacent to the new site boundary. The dwelling would also project closer to the front boundary of the

site compared to other properties on this cul-de-sac. The very close proximity to the rear boundary of the appeal site would also be apparent. This would give the proposed dwelling a cramped and contrived appearance, which would not sit comfortably within the relatively spacious plots of this suburban residential area. The projection forward of the side elevation of 204 as well as the neighbouring dwelling of 7 Lucknow Drive would add to the obtrusive appearance of the proposal within the streetscape of the cul-de-sac.

8. Furthermore, there is a strong rear building line along Sutton Road, particularly to the east. This contributes to a visual break between dwellings on Sutton Road and those on the cul-de-sac of Lucknow Drive. The proposed dwelling would project beyond this building line, which would add to the incongruous appearance of the dwelling in this area and diminish the separation of the dwellings within the cul-de-sac from those on Sutton Road. There are dwellings to the west along Sutton Road which project further to the rear, however they do not establish a prevailing context for the streetscape of the cul-de-sac which would justify the layout of the appeal proposal.
9. There is an existing garage on the site which would be demolished as part of the proposal. Although the garage is slightly wider than the proposed dwelling, it is of a single storey and smaller footprint. The garage therefore appears as a minor ancillary building to the rear of No 204, and does not establish a principle for a two storey dwelling on the site.
10. I conclude that the proposal would lead to significant harm to the character and appearance of the area due to its layout. The proposal would therefore be contrary to policies P1 and P2 of the Mansfield Local Plan 2020 which together seek to ensure high quality design and attractive streetscapes. The proposal would also be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework with regards to achieving well-designed places.

Other Matter

11. I note the frustrations expressed by the appellant in relation to the advice from the Council and the decision process leading up to this appeal. I also note that the appellant entered into discussions with the Council and that amendments were made with a view to finding a solution to concerns raised. However, these matters do not alter or outweigh my findings on the proposal before me, which I have considered on its planning merits.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

David Cross

INSPECTOR