



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 April 2024 by Darren Ellis MPlan MRTPI

Decision by F Wilkinson BSc (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 August 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/N3020/W/23/3331584

6 Winston Close, Mapperley, Nottinghamshire NG3 5SR

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Jack Digva against the decision of Gedling Borough Council.
 - The application reference is 2022/1299.
 - The development proposed is to convert the existing garage building into a self contained one bed flat.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the appeal site and the street.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site currently hosts a detached garage located in front of a two-storey dwelling in a residential area. The properties in the cul-de-sac are all large two-storey dwellings built with similar design characteristics and materials, which creates a pleasing consistency that contributes positively to the character and appearance of the street.
5. The conversion of the garage would result in a small single storey dwelling with habitable accommodation in the roof space. As such the proposed dwelling would fail to integrate with the built form of the cul-de-sac. Furthermore, although the building would not increase in size, it would have a cramped appearance given the limited size of the plot relative to the other properties in the street.
6. I note that planning permission has been granted to convert the existing garage into a 1-bed annexe¹. However, while the appearance of the annexe would be identical to the proposed dwelling, it would remain ancillary to the main house at No 6, as per condition 5 of the planning permission, and would

¹ Planning application ref. 2023/0431

not be a separate planning unit. As such the annexe would be able to share services and the garden area of No 6, whereas the subdivision of the site and creation of its own amenity area would result in a cramped appearance as described above.

7. Consequently, the proposed dwelling would detract from the character and appearance of the appeal site and the street. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policy 10 of the Greater Nottingham Aligned Core Strategies (2014) and Policies LPD 33 and 40 of the Gedling Borough Local Planning Document (2018) which all require, amongst other things and in regard to this main issue, development to have a high standard of design which does not harm the character of the area. The proposal would also conflict with the design aims of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Other Matters

8. The provision of one additional unit would only make a small meaningful difference to the existing supply. Economic advantages would arise from the conversion works and the occupation of a new dwelling, although some of these would be temporary and limited again by the scale of the scheme. I would therefore ascribe limited weight to these matters.
9. I understand the appellant's personal reasons for converting the garage into a dwelling for his son, however many of these reasons would also be met by the approved annexe. The economic advantages of the annexe would also be similar to the appeal proposal. As such, the additional benefits of the scheme would be limited and would not justify the harm identified above.

Conclusion and Recommendation

10. The proposal would be contrary to the development plan as a whole and there are no material considerations, including the approach of the Framework, worthy of sufficient weight that would indicate a decision other than in accordance therewith. I therefore recommend the appeal be dismissed.

Darren Ellis

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

11. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis I dismiss the appeal.

F Wilkinson

INSPECTOR