



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 May 2024

by S. Hartley BA (Hons) Dist.TP(Manc) DMS MRTPI MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 05 June 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/N3020/W/23/3336182

89 Sheepwalk Lane, Ravenshead, Nottinghamshire NG15 9FD

- 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 A. Brooks against the decision of Gedling Borough Council.
 - The application ref 2023/0391, dated 11 May 2023, was refused by notice dated 7 July 2023.
 - The development proposed is one detached dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. A revision to the National Planning Policy Framework 2023 (the Framework) was published on 19 December 2023. The amendments made did not have a bearing upon the issues in this appeal, and it was therefore not necessary to seek comments from the main parties upon it. Where I have referred to the Framework, it is that of the December 2023 version.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development upon the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and area.

Reasons

4. No.89 Sheepwalk Lane is a detached dwelling within a large garden and set well back from the lane. It is situated amongst other detached dwellings with generally similar large gardens fronting the lane.
5. There is generally a common building line, though its design importance is not readily noticeable or effective because of the extensive, dense landscaping to the front boundaries of the dwellings facing the lane.
6. The large gardens and landscaping add distinctively and positively to the character and appearance of the building and to that of the immediate area.

7. The proposal is for a detached dwelling to be constructed in the front garden area of No. 89 Sheepwalk Lane.
8. There is an absence of such dwellings constructed in the front gardens of the properties on this side of the road, though the appellant has referred to such development constructed in gardens on the opposite side of the lane. However, the character and appearance of the area differs markedly from one side of the lane to the other. The appeal property and dwelling on that side of the lane are characterised by being sited in large grounds, set well back from the lane. Dwellings on the opposite side are developed to a higher density, with many being constructed at the same time to a common, modern design with asymmetrical roofs and rendered, cream walls, in two lines of development and with one such line set close to the lane itself.
9. The appellant recognises in the submitted appeal statement (pps 12/13) that the dwellings opposite *'have a totally different effect on character and appearance of Sheepwalk Lane in terms of their hard, regimented visual prominence within the street scene and only partial screening to the front'*.
10. The proposed development, by its position in the front garden and by reducing its size, would adversely affect both its character and appearance and that of the area on the same side of the road. The harm in this respect would not be sufficiently mitigated by the proposed dwelling incorporating some of the design features of the modern dwellings opposite.
11. The appellant has referred to an earlier appeal¹ where a dwelling was allowed to the rear of the host property. However, this was for a site behind it and not within the large garden to the front.
12. Therefore, I conclude that it would not accord with policy LPD34 of the Council's Local Plan Document 2 Local Plan 2018 (LP) which states that development involving the loss of residential gardens will not be permitted unless the development proposal would represent a more efficient use of land at a location where higher densities are appropriate, or where it would result in a significant improvement to the urban development of the area. Neither of these caveats apply in this case.
13. It would be contrary to LP policy LPD40 which is resistant to development upon unallocated sites where this would lead to a loss of space which makes a contribution to the openness of the area. Furthermore, the proposed development would not conform to policy 10 of the Council's Aligned Core Strategies Part 1 Local Plan (2018) or with chapter 12 of the Framework, both of which stress the need for development to reinforce valued local characteristics. LP policy LPD35 is less pertinent in that this is concerned with the interconnection of streets and spaces.

Other Matters

14. Both parties accept that the appeal site is sustainably located, close to a range of facilities and bus routes. In addition, I acknowledge that the provision of a bungalow would add to the available mix of house types in the area, and also

¹ APP/N3020/A/01/1068514

that it would be at least partially screened from the road. These stand in favour of the proposed development. However, whether singly or cumulatively, they do not outweigh my conclusions upon the main issue.

Conclusion

15. For the above reasons, I conclude that the development should be dismissed.

S. Hartley

INSPECTOR