



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 April 2025 by Sara Manson DipTP

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6 May 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Q3060/D/25/3360656

22 Neston Drive, Nottingham, NG6 8QZ

- 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 Mr Abid Vanat against the decision of Nottingham City Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/01735/PFUL3.
 - The development proposed is a single storey and 2 storey rear extension.
-

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.

Preliminary Matters

3. The description of the proposed development above is taken from the application form and decision notice. It is clear from the plans and my site visit that the proposed development is for a two storey side and rear extension, and rear single storey extension. I have dealt with the appeal on this basis. The appellant has also advised of errors on the drawings including a window in bedroom 6 on the proposed plans, and the lack of set down on the existing. Both have been noted.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on a) the character and appearance of the area; and b) the living conditions of the occupiers of Numbers 20 (No 20) and 24 (No 24) Neston Drive, with specific regard to outlook and privacy.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Character and Appearance

5. The appeal building is one of a pair of semi-detached two storey relatively modern dwellings on a corner plot. It appears to have been extended over two storeys to the side. The immediate area comprises two clear dwelling design types which, by virtue of limited visible alterations, defined spacing between them, setbacks from the highway and gardens to the rear, lend a pleasant consistency, originality and spaciousness to the street which contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area.

6. The two-storey section would, by virtue mainly of its depth, appear as a significant and bulky addition. This would not only detract from the host's shape but also exhibit an overly shallow roof pitch unreflective of that of original building and the later extension. It would be clad in white weatherboarding which, whilst used in other places in the street, would emphasise its prominence and discordance due to the amount put to use against its more recessive, secondary and more minor use elsewhere and how it visually contrasts strongly with the more dominant materials used on other buildings in the street scene. These elements would combine to unacceptably reduce the quality of area's consistent and original feel. The single storey wrapping extension to the rear would be well screened from public views but would further subsume the original building to the detriment of its core shape and erode the pleasantness of the area's spaciousness.
7. As a consequence, the proposals would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area and thus be contrary to Policies DE1 and DE2 of the Nottingham City Council Local Plan, Part 2 - Land and Planning Policies 2020 (LP2), and Policy 10 of the Nottingham City Aligned Core Strategies, Part 1 Local Plan 2014 (LP1) which, amongst other things, seek to ensure that development respects and enhances the streetscene and character of the area through good design, having regard to massing, scale, proportion and materials used.

Living Conditions

8. There is an existing single storey extension built partly on the boundary with adjoining property No 20. However, the proposals would not only be building upon an established footprint. The garden shed referred to as part thereof is vastly different from the appeal proposals. The proposed single storey extension would increase the built development on this boundary, creating a long, high and continuous blank brick wall, without feature or visual break. Given this, it would be oppressive to users of the garden of No. 20 to the extent that it would present an overbearing effect that would lead to an unacceptably poor standard of outlook.
9. Similarly, the proposed rear elevation would project further towards the side boundary with No 24 and, although leaving a small gap, No 24 sits on a lower ground level than the appeal site, thereby the proposal would appear as a tall and continuous elevation. However, with the addition of bedroom windows in this elevation, it would lead not only to an unacceptably poor standard of outlook for users of the garden of No 24 but also an unacceptable loss of privacy. The appeal proposals would therefore conflict with Policy DE1 of LP2 and Policy 10 of LP1 which, amongst other things, seek to ensure the satisfactory level of living conditions of neighbouring occupiers are protected.

Other Matters

10. Neither of the appeal decisions cited are sufficiently comparable to the scheme before me and I have no compelling justification as to why, as a corner plot, alterations to the appeal building should be treated differently and no further details have been submitted to support why the proposals are similar to other extensions in the area. The proposed development has been considered on its own merits with regard to the specifics of its context.

Conclusion and Recommendation

11. For the reasons given above, the appeal proposals would conflict with the development plan and there are no sufficiently weighty material considerations to indicate a decision other than in accordance therewith. I therefore recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

Sara Manson

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

12. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR