

Report to Planning Committee

Application Number: 2020/1267

Appeal Ref: APP/N3020/D/21/3276987

Location: 241, Mansfield Road, Arnold, NG5 8LS

Proposal: Demolish existing garages and erect triple garage.

Case Officer: Nicolla Ellis

Planning permission was refused by the Borough Council on the 22nd March 2021 on the following grounds:

The design, location and scale of the proposed garage would result in an unduly prominent addition to the street scene which would visually prominent from both Mansfield Road and Birch Lea. The proposal would also be overbearing upon the host dwelling, competing in scale with the host dwelling and neighbouring properties and therefore would not respect the character or appearance of the local area. The development would therefore be contrary to Part 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework, Policy 10 of Gedling Borough Council Aligned Core Strategy (2014) and Gedling Borough Council Local Planning Document Policy 43 (2018).

An appeal against this decision was subsequently lodged with the Planning Inspectorate along with an application for an award of costs.

This appeal has been dismissed.

The application for an award of costs was refused.

The Planning Inspector considered that the proposed development and concluded that:-

The eastern boundaries of numbers 241 and 243 Mansfield Road comprise of hedges and trees, and the entrance to Birch Lea has large stone/concrete pillars either side of it. I acknowledge that these features restrict views of the site from Mansfield Road.

However, in contrast with the existing situation, there would be a large gable facing the Birch Lea entrance and a large expanse of roof that would project above the northern side boundary wall of the site, directly facing Birch Lea.

As such, the proposal would be very prominent in the Birch Lea street scene, clearly visible from the point of entry onto Birch Lea and up to the point just beyond the western boundary of the site. I therefore conclude that the proposal would be harmful to the street scene and therefore the appearance of the area.

In relation to the costs application the Inspector concluded:

Although the applicant considers the proposal is one the Council should not have refused, this is an opinion. The Council had every right to exercise its judgement in

appraising the application against development plan policies and taking account of other material considerations. I therefore consider that the Council did not behave unreasonably in refusing planning application Ref 2020/1267.

For the reasons outlined, I therefore conclude that it has not been demonstrated that the Council behaved unreasonably in respect of any substantive or procedural matters associated with the determination of application Ref 2020/1267.

Consequently, there has not been any unreasonable behaviour which caused the applicant to incur unnecessary or wasted expense in the appeal process, as described in the PPG. Therefore, an award of costs is not justified.

Recommendation: To note the information.